

1852 6-7 Aug
Hartford



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

LEO XIII. AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

LEO XIII
AND
ANGLICAN ORDERS

BY

Charles Hindley Wood, VISCOUNT HALIFAX

180 531

16.5.23.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1912

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
Introductory	1

CHAPTER II

Letters—1890, 1891, 1892, and part of 1893	40
--	----

CHAPTER III

Correspondence—July 1892 to July 1894—The Abbé Portal's Pamphlet, <i>Les Ordinations Anglicanes</i> —Its Division into Three Parts : (1) <i>Le Rite</i> , (2) <i>Le Ministre</i> , (3) <i>Le Sujet</i>	69
--	----

CHAPTER IV

The Abbé Portal's Visit to England—His Summons to Rome	88
--	----

CHAPTER V

Cardinal Vaughan's Address at Preston—The Abbé Portal's Visit to Rome—His Second Visit to England and his Interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury	105
---	-----

CHAPTER VI

Correspondence with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York—Cardinal Vaughan's Letter to the Archbishop of Toledo—Draft of Letter which it was suggested the Pope might write to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York—Mr. Athelstan Riley's interview with Cardinal Vaughan	127
--	-----

CHAPTER VII

	PAGE
Address on Reunion delivered at Bristol by Lord Halifax, 14th February 1895—Letters of English Bishops	180

CHAPTER VIII

Visit to Rome—Audience with Leo XIII.—Letter of Leo XIII. <i>Ad Anglos</i> —Its Reception in England—Letter from Constantine Pobiédonostzeff (Chief Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod), to Mr. W. J. Birkbeck	197
--	-----

CHAPTER IX

Correspondence arising out of the Letter <i>Ad Anglos</i> —Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, published in the <i>Times</i> , 30th August 1895—Cardinal Vaughan's Speech at Bristol, 9th September—Norwich Church Congress and Sermon of the Archbishop of York—Letters from Mr. Birkbeck as to Reunion with the Russian Church—Letter from the Prince of Wales (King Edward VII.) as to the Visit of the Bishop of Peterborough to Russia—Coronation of the Czar, 1896	226
--	-----

CHAPTER X

Visit to Paris, and Correspondence up to March 1896	247
---	-----

CHAPTER XI

Appointment of Commission to investigate into the Validity of English Orders—The Abbé Portal's Visit to London—Letter of the Archbishop of York to the Abbé Portal—The Rev. T. A. Lacey and Father Puller's Arrival in Rome—Correspondence up to April 24th	271
---	-----

CHAPTER XII

Mr. Gladstone's <i>Soliloquium</i> —The Abbé Duchesne's Degree at Cambridge—His Visit to Mr. Gladstone, in company with Father Puller	296
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII

The Encyclical <i>Satis Cognitum</i> —The Abbé Portal's Address delivered in London on the 14th of July—Letters to Cardinal Parocchi and Cardinal Rampolla	323
--	-----

CONTENTS

vii

CHAPTER XIV

	PAGE
Issue of the Bull <i>Apostolicae Curæ</i> —Triumph of Cardinal Vaughan —Correspondence up to the end of 1896—Summary of the <i>Risposta</i> by Mgr. Moyes and Abbot Gasquet in reply to the <i>De Re Anglicana</i> by the Rev. T. A. Lacey	354

CHAPTER XV

After Thoughts—Hopes for the Future	383
---	-----

APPENDIX I

Extracts from Letters (a), (b), (c), (d), written to the Abbé Portal in 1897, referring to subjects treated in the Correspondence, and dealing with the Vindication of English Ordinations sent by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII.—(e) Ex- tracts from letters written to Lady Halifax from Rome, June 1903	423
--	-----

APPENDIX II

Extracts from—

(a) Bossuet on the Sacrifice of the Mass.	
(b) Letter from the Abbé Portal in reference to the preceding.	
(c) Sermon by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newport on the same subject, delivered in May 1908.	
(d) Bishop Challoner's <i>Meditations for Every Day in the Year</i> .	
(e) Cardinal Newman on the Real Presence.	
(f) Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Author of <i>The Christian Year</i> , on the meaning of the term 'Transubstantiation.'	
(g) Two Verses from the well-known and popular Hymn by the late Rev. W. Bright, D.D.	436

APPENDIX III

Letter from Mr. Wilfrid Ward,	443
Index,	447

LEO XIII. AND ANGLICAN ORDERS.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

FOR a long time past I have hesitated whether or not to attempt a record of the events which took place in the years 1894, 1895, 1896 and 1897, in connection with the controversy about the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England, by the publication of documents and correspondence which should place the facts beyond dispute. No one is in a position to give so complete an account of those facts as I am. Much misapprehension existed both as to the facts themselves, and as to the motives of those to whose initiative these events were due, and such misapprehension could only effectually be removed by a publication of the correspondence. The efforts undertaken in the interests of peace in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896 seemed to have completely failed. Those responsible for that effort stood convicted in popular estimation of having made an egregious blunder, a blunder which, moreover, had had the effect of throwing fresh difficulties in the way of peace. Nevertheless, I hesitated, and for the following reasons.

I was indifferent as to the judgment passed upon myself : I knew my own motives, I knew what I had said and done, and saw nothing to be sorry for, nothing to retract. I was afraid, too, lest I might, unconsciously, be unjust to others in anything I wrote, and whether in some cases I might not create difficulties for those whose interests I was bound to consider. Moreover it was not certain whether I should get leave to publish all the letters necessary for

telling the whole story, and a partial account would be useless. I also shrank from the publicity of much that was private and personal, but without which my intimacy with the Abbé Portal and my correspondence with him would not have been intelligible. Above all, I was afraid of saying anything which might embitter controversy, which might misrepresent my feelings as to individuals, and which might incidentally prove a stumbling-block in the way of that reunion of Christendom and the healing of the breach between England and Rome which I so ardently desire.

These reasons for a long time determined my silence, but circumstances have altered. Nearly fifteen years have elapsed since September 1896. Leo XIII., Cardinal Vaughan, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, to mention no other names, have passed to their account: the lives both of Archbishop Benson and Cardinal Vaughan have been published: time has dispelled the irritation fatal to fair judgment. Events to be judged as a whole must be seen from a certain distance, what has occurred is gradually assuming its true proportions, and as it does so, we are enabled to form a juster judgment of the past, and of the prospects of reunion in the future. I have come to think that a narrative of the facts will help the cause of reunion instead of hindering it, that it will be useful to those who take up—as will surely be done—the work which the Abbé Portal and I attempted to do, and that the failure which attended our efforts may, in fact, prove a step in God's Providence towards that reunion of Christendom so earnestly desired by all those who have the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the objects for which He died at heart.

I propose to allow the letters and documents, so far as possible, to speak for themselves, merely prefixing to them such a summary of the events described in the correspondence itself as will make the story told in that correspondence intelligible. I shall add, when the story is told, a few observations on some of the questions suggested by the narrative, which I hope may do something to clear the issues, and so to promote the interests of peace

My thanks are due to His Majesty the King, who has graciously allowed me to publish a letter written by His Majesty King Edward VII., when Prince of Wales, as to the visit of the Bishop of Peterborough to Russia in May 1896. I have, in the next place, to thank the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has allowed me to print a letter of his written in the spring of 1895. I have also to express my gratitude to all those who have kindly permitted their letters to appear, amongst whom I must mention the name of Mr. Wilfrid Ward, so many of whose letters occur in the correspondence. More particularly I have to thank Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, the Rev. T. A. Lacey, and Father Puller, S.S.J.E., who have revised the proofs, and given me quite invaluable assistance in all that concerns the contents and arrangement of this book. My best thanks are also due to Mr. Edmund Gosse, who has been good enough to go through the proofs, and to whose suggestions and advice I am deeply indebted. I have to thank Miss Christian Burke for the great trouble she has taken in compiling the Index, and last, but not least, I have to tender my warmest thanks to Miss Wellington, to whose help and unwearied assistance in preparing this volume for the press, I owe more than I can express.

The desire for reunion with the Holy See is no new thing in England. How indeed is it possible for any intelligent and loyal member of the English Church not to desire the restoration of the ancient relations which once existed between Canterbury and Rome? Our Lord, as the bishops assembled at the Lambeth Conferences have more than once reminded us, did not intend the members of His Body to be outwardly separated from one another. Belief in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in the Communion of Saints is incompatible with acquiescence in the divisions of Christendom. To be indifferent to the associations which connect themselves with the Apostolic See, and with the long line of Popes who in their persons sum up so much of the history of the Church, is to be out of harmony with the whole current of Christian tradition. Some of the greatest glories of the Church of

England connect themselves with the days when her relations with the Roman See were uninterrupted. All must surely desire to hasten the day when the members of the one Church shall again be at peace with one another, and united in the external bonds of one visible Communion. Ever since the beginning of the schism this desire for peace and reconciliation has from time to time found expression. It will be found in varying form and intensity throughout the whole history of the Church of England since the separation, and the Oxford Movement in this, as in so much else, did but bring into prominence principles inherent in the position claimed by the Church of England, and desires inevitably resulting from those principles. Those principles, and desires for reunion with the Apostolic See accentuated themselves strongly in the years between 1857 and 1870. It was in 1857 that the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom was founded. Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* was published in 1865. His visit to France for the purpose of interesting the French Episcopate in the cause of reunion took place about the same time. The Bishop of Brechin's book on the Articles, to which Dr. Pusey wrote a preface, and which he had hoped might have won a hearing from the English Roman Catholics, was published in 1868, and, later again, before the opening of the Vatican Council in 1870, other steps, chiefly associated with the names of Bishop Forbes (of Brechin), Mr. Gerald Cobb, the author of the *Kiss of Peace*, and the Bollandist, de Buck, were taken, to see if something more formal might not be attempted in the direction of peace.

For some time great hopes were entertained. Mgr. Darboy, the Archbishop of Paris, so soon afterwards to be murdered under the Commune, admitted that the relations which had grown up between Rome and the Episcopate were very different from what they had been in earlier times. Dr. Newman wrote that no one was bound to believe that the Pope outside of a General Council was infallible, and Father Lockhart, in the *Weekly Register*, suggested that reunion on the basis suggested by Dr. Pusey was better than perpetual schism. Dr. Pusey, in thanking the

editor, asserted that the Council of Trent demanded nothing which could not be explained to the satisfaction of English Churchmen.

To Archbishop Manning, however, and many who thought with him, such attempts at peace seemed nothing less than disastrous. Dr. Pusey's pacific intentions were denied. He was represented at Rome as only desiring to attack the Roman Church and prevent conversions. Writing to Mgr. Talbot, Archbishop Manning declared that the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom was part of a system 'which was deceiving many Catholics and would give much trouble if it were not cut down to the bone.' And again, in reply to Mgr. Talbot, who, in reference to Dr. Newman's letter to Dr. Pusey on the subject of the *Eirenicon*, had expressed the opinion that 'Dr. Newman's spirit must be crushed,' he wrote :—

'What you say about Newman is true. He has become the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, critical of Catholic devotions, and always on the lower level. It is the old Anglican patristic literary Oxford tone transplanted into the Church, in a word, it is worldly Catholicism. . . . Mr. Ward and Faber may exaggerate, but they are a thousand times nearer the mind and spirit of the Holy See than those [Newman and others] who oppose them. Between us and them [Newman, etc.] there is a far greater distance than between them and Dr. Pusey's book [the *Eirenicon*]. . . . What makes me the more anxious,' Manning added, 'is that there is a similar school growing up in France.'

Eventually, owing to Cardinal Manning's influence, the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom was condemned, the Memorandum addressed to Rome on the subject being evidently determined by the same kind of considerations as those which were urged at Rome in 1894, 1895, and 1896 in reference to the question of the validity of English Orders. The Vatican Council, for which preparations were then being made, still further emphasized the difficulties in the way of peace. Dr. von Döllinger, writing to the Bishop of Brechin in 1868, in reference to the

Bishop's book on the Articles, published in the interests of reunion, had said :—

I do not think the younger generation of English clergy will be prevented from adopting views which under God's gracious dispensation may lead to a future reunion. On the other hand, if that consummation, devoutly to be wished, is to be made possible, several important changes and reforms must take place in the Roman Catholic Church of the West. I could wish that our friend Pusey had mentioned more distinctly these serious stumbling-blocks, for the Ultramontane party, particularly in France and England, refuse to see the beam in their eye, and talk constantly as if they were invulnerable and immaculate, and as if the Oriental and Anglican Churches had only to say with contrite heart and mien, '*mea culpa*,' and to submit unconditionally to every error of theory and every abuse in practice. The approaching Council fills many reflecting sons of the Church with dismay, for there is a mighty power at work which intends to use the Council as an engine for the corroboration of their favourite views. My hope and consolation is that a small but resolute body of bishops who will make resistance is quite sufficient to frustrate their designs, but there must be some moral courage.¹

¹ Cf. with the following letter from the Bishop of Durham (the Rt. Rev. Brooke Foss Westcott) to me, dated 27th February 1895 —

'Allow me to thank you for the copy of your Address [delivered at Bristol, 14th February 1895, p. 183], which I have read carefully with very deep interest.

'I need not say that I sympathise most heartily with your main object. The experience of the Mission Field, to which my thoughts are continually turned, constrains me to seek with most ardent desire the unity of Christendom, and I am often led to believe that the way to unity will be opened to us from that larger world outside. We must, I think, look beyond the West, and when we do so, union with Rome assumes a new aspect. Union with Rome unreformed would, I believe, be fatal to the greater hope. The hope of unity has, I humbly trust, been committed to our English Church, and if we are faithful to her mission it will in good time be realised. Our danger lies in the not unnatural haste of many with narrow views, as I venture to think, to adopt Romish corruptions. Our strength lies in simple loyalty to our own formularies and ritual.

'Bishop Barrington, in the Charge which you quote, insists on the necessity of reform in the Roman Church as a preliminary to union. The reform is even more necessary now when fresh metaphysical deductions are imposed on the consciences of men, and I can see no encouragement in the Pope's Encyclical. He requires submission, as Rome has always required it; that, for the sake of Christendom and for the sake of Apostolic Truth, we could not yield. To speak of reform in Rome seems to be indulging in dreams, but with God all things are possible, and we can

The fears entertained by Dr. von Döllinger and others were but too well founded. The issue of the Council seemed to shatter the hopes of the possible reunion which he and Dr. Pusey had nourished. To Archbishop Manning, on the other hand, the assertion of the Pope's infallibility¹ '*personalis separata et absoluta*' seemed to be the triumph of the principles he had set himself to assert.

At the Council itself it had been objected that the definition would be productive of many evils, and amongst these that it would hinder conversions. The Bishop of Orleans² had said: 'I shed tears of blood at the thought of the souls which will be lost.' Archbishop Manning had replied that the concentration of the supreme authority of the Church in the hands of the Pope was essential in the interests of society, and the most efficacious step that could be taken against the dangers with which the Papacy was threatened in Italy, that the infallibility of the Head followed logically from the infallibility of the Body, that Anglicans rejected the former because they rejected the latter, and that many would join the Church if the infallibility was declared.

The proclamation³ of Papal infallibility, however, did not check the progress of the Revolution in Italy, or produce the harvest of individual conversions Archbishop Manning had anticipated; but this had yet to be seen. At the moment it appeared to have made all attempts at reunion hopeless; but time, which tests all things, has modified a judgment which once was general. The lapse of forty

pray for an issue which, as we believe, answers to the will of God. There is no promise to which I turn more often, and strive to direct others, than that which assures us that "in our patience we shall win our souls." Trusting to this I can make my own all that you say in your last paragraph. If we offer ourselves without reserve to Christ, He will use us in His loving wisdom.'

¹ 'Nullum dubium de Pontificis infallibilitate personali, separata et absoluta, aut ipse [Archbishop Manning] habet, aut aliis ut habeant permittere vult. Eam doctrinam esse fidei assertit' (the Archbishop of St. Louis's account of Manning's speech at the Vatican Council).—*Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. ii. p. 456.

² Mgr. Dupanloup.

³ The definition of Papal infallibility was proclaimed on the 18th July 1870. On the 19th July, the day after the definition, war was declared between France and Germany, and two months later the Italians took possession of Rome, which they have retained ever since.

years has shown that the effects of the definition of Papal infallibility were not to be all that its promoters wished, or that its opponents feared. If it could be shown that Papal infallibility was not something distinct from the infallibility of the Church, then a door was left open for explanations, and with the possibility of such explanations the duty of attempting them, in the interests of peace, was manifest.

Amongst the last words which fell from Dean Church, the scholar, the historian, the friend of Newman, the brilliant chronicler of the Oxford Movement, the Dean who preferred St. Paul's and his studious life to the highest place in the English Church, were these :—

If anything is certain, it is that a temper which loves, which honours, which desires peace is the essence of the Christian character. Do we realise this enough? Do we consider what we may do to promote peace? Or are we so immersed in our own affairs, so little careful of the highest interests of the Gospel of peace, that we are content to leave all thought and hope of the reunion of Christendom to some future day which may dawn in heaven, but is never likely or intended to be realised on earth?

It was under the inspiration of such a hope that the endeavours to prepare the way for reunion between England and Rome, the account of which is given in the following pages, were entered upon. The circumstances that led to those endeavours must, however, be related.

We were advised somewhat suddenly at the end of 1889, for the sake of my eldest son, who had had a violent attack of pleurisy, to go to Madeira for the rest of the winter. We started two or three days before Christmas, and arrived at Funchal at the close of December.

We had occasion—I forget now the reason, but I think it was in connection with some of their poor—to visit the House of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul. We met there a French priest belonging to the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, a Lazarist, who had been given work in Madeira for reasons of health. That priest was the Abbé Portal, and that accidental meeting was the beginning of an intimacy which has given me a friend such as few men possess.

I do not know if the Abbé guessed our anxieties and thought he might help us. I believe his superiors permitted the intimacy in the hope that it might lead to my submission to the Roman Church. I see the Abbé himself alludes to something of the kind in a letter to which I shall have occasion to refer, but in any case I was attracted by the Abbé, which will not be a matter of surprise to any one who has the pleasure of his acquaintance—he, perhaps, was also attracted by me. We used often to walk together in leisure moments, and once or twice when he happened to have a spare day we made expeditions into the hills together. In those walks we naturally talked of the objects which interested us both, and among them the position and teaching of the English Church had a large place. I found him as ignorant of that history and teaching as are the generality of foreigners, and, with a view to his enlightenment on that subject, I remember lending him a Latin edition of the Prayer Book, and pointing out how largely the revision of the Breviary by Cardinal Quignonez had influenced the English Offices for Mattins and Evensong, and, apart from the dislocation of the Canon, the practical identity of the service for Holy Communion in the English Prayer Book with the form for saying Mass in the Roman Missal. The facts were entirely new to him, and they led to discussions on the contents of the Prayer Book and the Articles which excited his interest. They also led to our talking of the reunion of Christendom, the subject which, ever since the publication of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, and indeed before, had been nearest to my heart; and I can remember now as if it were yesterday saying how much I believed might be done with good will on both sides—we were talking of England and Rome—to prepare the way for a better understanding, with a view to eventual reconciliation, how infinitely grievous it was to see the indifference of Christians on the subject, and how little they seemed to realise the injury our divisions did to the cause of truth and the spread of the Gospel. I remember also adding how impossible it seemed to me to read the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel without being

on fire to do what little we could to promote the fulfilment of the prayer offered by our Lord for His Church before His Passion. 'Did not,' I said, 'the whole state of the world and of the Church cry out for such an endeavour? And was it not a cause almost of despair, and certainly of the deepest grief, to realise how much indifference, ignorance, and prejudice had to do with keeping Christians apart?'

Conversations such as these, the consideration of the subject and of the temper of men's minds on both sides, convinced us that if anything was to be done in the interests of peace, two things were indispensable: First, to kindle and spread the desire for union; secondly, to discover some definite object which should not only excite those desires and give expression to them, but should provide a point of contact, if the authorities on both sides desired it, which might naturally lead on to other and further discussions.

Such a point of contact we came eventually to think could best be found in the consideration of the English Ordinal. It was certain that the Church of England had nothing to lose from the fullest and frankest investigation into the facts of the case. It was certain that foreign ecclesiastics and theologians were, as a rule, very imperfectly informed on the subject,¹ as on other points connected with the claims and position of the Church of England; and it was no less certain that if an examination of the question could lead to a reconsideration of the existing Roman practice of treating Anglican Orders as invalid, a great step in the direction of peace would have been taken. Nothing, indeed, was so likely to appeal to the members of the English Church, and to create a willingness

¹ The late Lord Bute, writing to me on the 24th October 1895, said: 'On an archaeological expedition with the Archdeacon of Brindisi, I spoke incidentally of the daily services of the Anglican cathedrals, and he remarked that their worship differed fundamentally from Catholic worship, since that of Anglicans was essentially based upon a sermon, while that of Catholics was based upon the idea of Prayer and Praise; and I remember once reading to the Duke of Norfolk some of the Book of Common Prayer, and his remarking that that was all very well, but that I must not take a Ritualistic Manual based upon Catholic sources such as I was reading as giving an utterance of the Anglican Church.'

to enter into conference upon other and confessedly more difficult subjects.

To pursue this subject would be to anticipate the correspondence. I will merely add that the Abbé left Madeira in company with the Bishop of Funchal for a tour in Italy in May 1890. We ourselves left Madeira in June. My son died the following September. Lady Halifax was seriously ill all the autumn and winter of 1890, and the early spring of 1891. We were ordered abroad in the summer of 1891, and again in the spring and summer of 1892. In the April of that year I spent a few days with the Abbé Portal at the Grand Séminaire at Cahors, where I made acquaintance with various members of the French clergy, and was presented to the bishop. On those occasions I saw a great deal of the Abbé, with whom all along I had kept up an active correspondence. I see by a reference to our letters that we had discussed at some considerable length the question of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church. He had also been reading the history of the Vatican Council by Mgr. Cecconi, which brought to his notice what had been attempted at that time by Father de Buck, one of the Bollandists, in the interests of reunion. The result was that he urged me strongly to write something on the subject of the English Ordinal, with a view to its circulation abroad. In a letter dated the beginning of 1892, he says :—

Why not lay the matter before the Roman authorities? It has the advantage of involving merely questions of fact, not of doctrine, and only to enter into a discussion would mean the beginning of negotiations, and in such a matter, as in so much else, it is the first step which is the great difficulty.

Other letters in the same sense passed between us, with the result that in a letter of mine to the Abbé in the summer of 1892, I told him that I had been working at a paper on the English Ordinal, and that I had seen Cardinal Vaughan on the subject. I see from my diary that on the 4th July I called upon the Cardinal, in the hope of obtaining his help on behalf of a serious effort in the interests of reunion.

I insisted how much might be done by a friendly and sympathetic attitude on the part of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to bring back the Church of England into communion with the Holy See, how much the Cardinal could himself do on that behalf, that nothing was so great a cause of irritation as the attitude adopted by those authorities in regard to the Orders and Sacraments conferred by the Church of England, as he might understand by putting himself in our position, and that if an investigation into the facts led to a reconsideration of that attitude on the part of Rome, a step, the importance of which could not be exaggerated, would have been taken in the interests of peace. I urged as another reason for such a course that in regard to Holy Orders there was no doctrinal difference between England and Rome, as might be supposed to exist in other cases, as, for example, in the relation of the Holy See to the whole Church, but merely a question of fact : had the Church of England, or had it not, preserved the succession, and what was admitted on both sides to be necessary for the transmission of a valid priesthood. No doubt, an admission of the validity of English Orders would be but one step in the way of reunion, but it would be a very important and far-reaching one : there would always remain the crucial question of the relation of the Holy See to the rest of the Church, but on this point I ventured to say the Roman position was less clear than on many others ; it was certain that it was more difficult to substantiate modern Papal claims on the basis of the '*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,' than it was, for example, to make good the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, that it was a wise policy to begin with easier matters first, and to reserve the more difficult ones to the last, inasmuch as agreement upon the first would facilitate an agreement upon the second, and that for these and many similar reasons I earnestly entreated him to take the matter in hand and further a movement which might be fraught with such untold blessings to the Christian world.

To this the Cardinal replied that the question of Rome was the crucial question, that it was the question which

would have to be settled in the end, and that it was therefore better to begin with it—exactly the opposite course to that which I had advocated.

I mention this because it is a proof that from the first I had been anxious to take Cardinal Vaughan into counsel, to secure his assistance, and to work with and through him, and that the attitude he assumed, then and later, was not due in any degree to a desire on my part, or on that of the Abbé Portal, to put him and those he represented on one side.

Lady Halifax was ill in the summer of 1892, and we were again abroad. In 1893 we had other domestic troubles and losses, and though the Abbé and I continued our correspondence, I was able to do but little literary work myself. Eventually, despairing of obtaining from me such a paper on the English Ordinal as we had contemplated, the Abbé published his own treatise on the Ordinal. That pamphlet, which appeared in a separate form in February 1894, resulted in a double movement which in fact corresponded with the double object of the pamphlet. On the theological side, the theologians, who wondered a little at the revival of the controversy on the validity of English Orders, which outside England was well-nigh forgotten, discussed the weight of the arguments and expressed contradictory opinions in regard to them. It was, however, obvious to those who were the least conversant with the subject, that the real object of the pamphlet had been to raise the question of reunion between England and Rome, and, in consequence, while the theological discussion was in progress, others, such as writers in the *Univers*, took up the question of reunion. In regard to the subject of the pamphlet, the intervention of the Abbé Duchesne, who declared himself formally in favour of the validity of English Ordinations, was useful and important: the letter of Cardinal Bourret, the Bishop of Rodez, on the subject of reunion was less so: it had, however, the great advantage of provoking a reply from the Bishop of Salisbury.

This, then, was the state of affairs in July 1894: the subject had been taken up, the press in France was inter-

ested in the question of reunion, and the double object of the Abbé's pamphlet had been secured. The desire for reunion was further promoted by the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Union of the Churches, which appeared at that moment, and by the overtures the Pope was making to the Eastern Churches. All this encouraged a favourable reception of the idea of reunion, while the neighbourhood of England, what was known of Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, and the interest taken in the general results of the Oxford Movement, all helped the disposition in France to take up the question.

What I and others felt on the subject may be gathered from the following extracts ¹ of a letter from myself to the Abbé on the 11th July 1894 :—

What is certain is that if God grant us life and is willing to make use of us, we are going to work with all our heart and soul for the reunion of the Church of England with the Holy See. Even to think of such a thing is a joy, and as Lord Lothian,² a friend of mine, said the other day : 'The idea of putting an end to the schism of the sixteenth century is so splendid and entrancing, that it is hard to picture to oneself what its realisation would be.' . . . What we have to do in the interests of such reunion, without compromising the truth, is to put the most favourable construction on all that has been done in the past, and all that is being done in the present. I am convinced that as between us there is nothing touching the doctrine of the Sacraments upon which agreement would not be easy, if both sides were ready to offer explanations, and to insist only on that which is *de fide*, leaving people free to believe more or less about everything which was not such. As an illustration of what I mean, the Greeks and the Latins both make use of the term 'Transubstantiation' to express the doctrine of the Real Presence. The manner in which the Greeks and Latins treat the Blessed Sacrament '*extra usum*' is absolutely different. Allow other matters to be treated in an analogous manner, and at one stroke you would have got rid of three-fourths of the obstacles which now stand in the way of reunion. Experience and the lapse of time show that words and formularies

¹ The complete letter appears in its place in the correspondence, p. 88.

² Schomberg Henry, ninth Marquis of Lothian. Died 17th January 1900.

have not always the precise force which at one time was attributed to them, and that there may be room for explanations which at one time seemed absolutely excluded. For example, if the Decrees of the Vatican Council are open to the interpretation that the Pope is only infallible when he has taken all necessary means to inform himself as to what is the teaching of the Church, and when he is declaring what that teaching is, it is obvious that there is a possibility of agreement in regard to a matter upon which not so long ago agreement appeared impossible. And what is true of this is true of other matters. No doubt, from a human point of view, almost insurmountable difficulties stand in the way of reunion. There are a thousand things in our present condition which must shock you terribly, but with God everything is possible, and if Leo XIII. would seriously take the work of reunion in hand, it is impossible to exaggerate how great might be the result of such an attempt.

The summer of 1894, in fact, led to important developments. The Abbé had met at Paris many who were interested in the question, with whom he had not previously been personally acquainted. He had spent a good part of August in England (see pp. 95-101), and in September he was summoned to Rome by Leo XIII., in consequence of communications made from Paris to Cardinal Rampolla. A few days later he returned to England to acquaint us with the wonderful news of the wishes and hopes of the Pope. I never can forget the impression that news produced. Things had moved with a rapidity which no one could have expected, and to those who were concerned in them, it was impossible not to feel that it was not they but a Power behind them which was controlling events.

The Abbé came straight back from Rome to England without stopping. He arrived at Hickleton on the 24th September, and on the 28th I took him down to Devonshire to see the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Abbé gave a full account of what had passed at Rome. He spoke of his interviews with Cardinal Rampolla, and of his audiences with the Pope. He explained that the letter addressed to him by Cardinal Rampolla was an indirect step to make sure of the friendly dispositions of the heads of the English

Church, and that, if the Archbishops could indirectly give him such assurance, direct overtures in the interests of reunion would be made to the Archbishops by the Pope. For this purpose it was suggested that a letter might possibly be written to me 'analogous to the one written to the Abbé by Cardinal Rampolla, which I might take to Rome.' The Archbishop's attitude was not encouraging. The proposal was in any case startling to one unprepared for it, and it was clear the Archbishop felt himself in a difficult position. A direct communication from the Pope, he said, would have spoken for itself, a private, indirect communication was liable to be misinterpreted; that in his responsible position he had to guard against the possibility of misrepresentation, and the dangers which such misrepresentation might produce. He objected that the communication emanated from Cardinal Rampolla, and not from the Pope, that the change of plan at the Vatican, after the interval of a few days, threw doubts upon the Pope's intention to make any direct communication to the heads of the English Church. He also alluded to the attitude of Cardinal Vaughan as directly contradicting what was represented to be the friendly feeling at the Vatican, to the responsibility resting on him as the head of the English Church, and to the need of caution in a matter which, if misrepresented, was so likely to produce division at home. He agreed, however, to consider the matter very carefully, and to write after he had done so.

More than a fortnight elapsed without my hearing from the Archbishop, and on the 18th of October I wrote to him, begging for such a letter as I desired, enclosing a short statement of the facts and the draft of such a letter as I thought the Pope might write without provoking the dangers of which the Archbishop was apprehensive. My letter crossed one from him, dated the 15th, which elicited another from me dated 22nd of October (see Correspondence, p. 138), in which I ventured to suggest certain modifications in his letter of the 15th, asking whether it would not be possible for him to confer with the Archbishop of York on the subject.

I was expecting to receive such a modified letter as I desired from the Archbishop when, following Cardinal Vaughan's speech at Preston, there appeared in the *Times* a letter from him to the Archbishop of Toledo, in which he absolutely denied the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England, and talked of the English Church as a Protestant sect, subject to the civil power. How greatly the Cardinal's attitude increased the difficulties of obtaining such a letter as I was hoping for from the Archbishop of Canterbury was obvious. Writing to Mr. Wilfrid Ward on the 30th October I pointed out what an impediment that action was in the way of all that was being attempted, and how little calculated it was to further the Pope's wishes.

Other correspondence ensued with the result of further delay, but towards the end of the year, having heard from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and influenced by a very generous letter from the Cardinal himself in reference to the Toledo incident, I begged Mr. Athelstan Riley, who was well acquainted with the Cardinal (being unwell myself), to call on him, and explain fully all I was hoping might be done at Rome, and again to beg his assistance in promoting the cause of reunion. A memorandum of the interview between Mr. Riley and Cardinal Vaughan will be found in its proper place in the correspondence. How little these representations availed may be seen from the Cardinal's own account of his action on his arrival in Rome early in 1895.¹

¹ Cardinal Vaughan told the Pope that there was no chance of corporate reunion, that they should only look for individual conversions, that a letter addressed to the Anglicans might easily be used as a ground for keeping back such conversions; it would be said, 'The Pope is by degrees coming to terms, we must remain where we are.' He told the Pope of the effect produced already in this direction by the report that he was going to write to the Protestant Archbishops, that the only anxiety was to strengthen the Anglican position in order to keep waverers from Rome, and that in England all were opposed to the Papal supremacy. To Cardinal Rampolla he insisted on the mischief that was being done by 'those Frenchmen in taking up matters they do not properly understand.' He impressed on the Roman authorities that 'Halifax and his party are anxious to get some kind of recognition, anything that can suggest a hope of recognition will serve their purpose. They are also most anxious to get some kind of assurance about their Orders, at least a statement that

Meanwhile, in pursuance of the original idea of promoting discussion on the question of Orders and other controverted points, and of informing the minds of foreign ecclesiastics as to the principles and position of the English Church, Mr. Denny and Mr. Lacey wrote their dissertation *De Hierarchia Anglicana*. It was published in Latin, with a preface by the Bishop of Salisbury. With the same object, and in order to draw out an expression of opinion in favour of reunion at home, I endeavoured in an address delivered to the members of the English Church Union at Bristol early in 1895 to give a detailed account of the previous attempts at reunion both in England and abroad.

I allude to that Address because the letters¹ it elicited showed how deeply the question of reunion appealed to men's hearts, and how favourably any proposals for conferences on disputed questions were likely to be received.

In March 1895, Mr. Birkbeck and I went to Rome. When we had the honour of being received by the Pope shortly after our arrival, I had an opportunity of presenting him with a copy of the *De Hierarchia*, and also with a memorandum to which certain letters in reference to my speech at Bristol and to the subject of conferences between theologians on both sides were appended. In that Memorandum, after reciting the result of the Abbé Portal's interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Archbishop of Canterbury's reception of Cardinal Rampolla's letter, I expressed the opinion that though no doubt it would be unjust to make Cardinal Vaughan responsible for the hesitations of the Archbishop, the Cardinal's attitude had certainly largely contributed to them. I also ventured to say that the result of the letters submitted to His Holiness seemed to me more than sufficient to assure him of the favourable reception which would be given in England to any direct proposals from Rome for conferences between

they are possibly valid. But this again is to keep souls back from submission to the Church. 'I have,' the Cardinal added, 'my hands quite full with pressing these facts on people here.'—*Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 177, and following pages.

¹ See correspondence, p. 187.

Roman and English theologians on the subject of Orders, and other disputed questions, and I added if I might dare to make such a request, that I would beg His Holiness to address a letter in the interests of reunion to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, for presentation to the English, American and Colonial bishops shortly to assemble at Lambeth on the occasion of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the arrival of St. Augustine in England. I even ventured to indicate the lines of such a letter as would be favourably received by all parties in England, and I went on to express the conviction that if a letter were written on such lines, the effect it would have in England in the interests of reunion would be immense. I also insisted upon the fact, which would not be disputed by any one acquainted with the national character and the loyalty of Englishmen to the Church of England and to the Anglican Episcopate, that, on general grounds, and more especially in view of Cardinal Vaughan's recent utterances, any communication from Rome which ignored the heads of the English Church would fail of its object. At the close of the audience I had an opportunity of mentioning the rumour,¹ that the Holy Office was likely to intervene in the question of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church. In reply, the Pope said clearly that this would not be. Some allusion was made to general matters, including the appointment of Bishops in England, and to the possibility of conferences on disputed points between theologians on both sides. Then,

¹ When Mr. Birkbeck and I arrived at Rome, the rumour was current that the Abbé's pamphlet, *Les Ordinations anglicanes*, and the review of it by M. Duchesne in the *Revue Critique*, were likely to be referred, or had been referred, to the Holy Office, with the question whether it was a safe opinion to hold the validity of English Orders. Evidently such a question, in view of the existing practice of the Roman Church, could only be answered in one way. This would, indeed, have left the question of the validity of those Orders exactly where it was, but it would have sounded like a condemnation, and it would have had the effect of condemning as 'temerarious' the opinions put forward by the Abbé Duchesne. When I came to Rome, it was announced that the Holy Office was about to give the answer desired, even the day for the decision was said to be fixed; and that the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the Jesuit organ, had a series of articles ready to emphasise the decision of the Holy Office so soon as it should be made public.

referring to the copy of the *De Hierarchia*, which I had presented to him, and which the Pope had on his knee, he said he meant to look into the matter himself. The audience was concluded by the Pope giving us his blessing.

Before leaving Rome, I recapitulated in a letter to Cardinal Rampolla (given in the correspondence) the reasons which had prompted the action of the Abbé Portal and myself, emphasizing again how much might be done to further reunion by conferences on disputed points, including the question of Orders, if conducted in a friendly spirit on both sides.

The Pope granted us, including the Abbé Portal, a final private audience on the 17th April, after we had assisted at his Mass. It was impossible to be kinder or more encouraging. He took our daughter's head in his hands, as we knelt at his feet, and said, '*Mon enfant, il faut revenir me voir.*' He gave us several times over his blessing, and told us, as Cardinal Rampolla had told me the night before, to take courage, not to mind difficulties, and to persevere in our work, which would surely bring God's blessing upon us and all connected with it. After leaving the Vatican we all went to St. Peter's to pray before the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, and after that before the altar where St. Gregory the Great is buried. I left for Florence the next day.

The Pope's letter *Ad Anglos* was published in the *Times* on the 20th of April.¹ That it was not addressed to the Archbishops directly was due to Cardinal Vaughan, as were also the concluding paragraphs of the letter. The use that was made of those concluding paragraphs may be seen by a reference to the article in the *Times* of April 22nd, which was a complete transcript of Cardinal Vaughan's mind, and gave exact expression to his wishes. The way, however, in which it was received, even with the concluding paragraphs, more than justified the conviction I had expressed as to the welcome which would have

¹ Cf. with sketch of suggested letter, p. 135.

been accorded to a letter from the Pope to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York drafted on the lines suggested, and the effect such a letter would have had in the interests of reunion.

There was further discussion during the summer and autumn. Abbot Gasquet and others were employed in collecting materials in support of their contention that the Orders conferred by the Church of England were invalid ; the Pope, in the interests of reunion, was anxious to change what had been the practice of the Roman Church in regard to English Ordinations, and was undecided whether for this purpose the appointment of a Commission for further investigation was required ; Cardinal Vaughan was urging the Pope to make no change in favour of the English Church without the fullest investigation, undertaken with the assistance and co-operation of representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in England, an investigation involving the appointment of a formal commission. Those with whom I was acting were anxious for an investigation, and to that extent in accord with Cardinal Vaughan, though for directly opposite motives, and mainly as an opportunity for conferences in the interests of reunion on disputed points at which both sides should be represented.¹

On the 9th September 1895, Cardinal Vaughan made a speech at Bristol, in which he defined the kernel of the question of reunion to be the authority of the Pope by divine right to teach and govern the whole Church, and that without any explanation or discussion as to the nature or limits of that authority. The English Ordinal, he said, was compiled with the object of excluding the sacrificial power of the priesthood ; and this also was said without any attempt to explain the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The suggestion of corporate reunion, he added, savoured wholly of flesh and blood ; there was no hope for reunion except by individual submission to the See of Peter, and the obstacle to this submission was pride.

About the same time the Archbishop of Canterbury

¹ This is confirmed by Abbot Gasquet, *Leaves from My Diary*, pp. 35, 36, 37.

published a letter¹ in regard to which, writing to the Abbé Portal, I say :—

The utterances of the Cardinal and the Archbishop leave much to be desired. I hope to insist at the Congress at Norwich on the rights of the Pope, *jure divino*, as successor of St. Peter on the one side, and on the rights of the Episcopate as derived directly from our Lord on the other. These are the two truths which have to be recognised and combined; they indicate, I think, the point where peace can be made. When one reflects upon God's patience with our shortcomings, and more especially with our stupidities, one may well try to practise a little patience oneself. After all, Rome was not built in a day!

The sermon of the Archbishop of York at the Church Congress at Norwich, advocating reunion, and suggesting the possibility of a reconsideration of the Thirty-Nine Articles in the interests of peace was preached in the autumn of that year. In that sermon the Archbishop had made use of such expressions as the following :—

Reunion is in the air . . . a voice from Rome has spoken to us . . . it breathes from first to last a spirit of fatherly love . . . the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as understood by St. Gregory in the sixth century or by St. Bernard in the twelfth was widely different from the idea which is now pressed upon us . . . a return to the earlier conception is not beyond the bounds of hope . . . a Pope of the seventeenth century declared his predecessors were responsible for the loss of England, we may well hope that the day will come when another Pope may be the instrument of reconciliation.

Speaking myself at the Congress, I said :—

It is not compromise that is wanted, but explanations on both sides. Let me attempt an example of such explanation, and that with reference to the point which the Cardinal tells us is the 'crucial one—the very kernel—the whole question of reunion.' 'What,' the Cardinal asks, 'is the meaning of the reunion of Christendom?' And he replies, 'It means a return to the constitutional corporate union of the head and the members of the Church which existed before the break-up of Christendom

¹ See p. 224, also *Times*, 30th August 1895.

in the sixteenth century. Until then all the nations of Western Christendom were united to the Apostolic See of Rome. It was a constitutional corporate union of the head and members." Reunion, then, must mean a return to the visible union which formerly existed, and the kernel of the question is the admission of the claim that the Pope is head of the visible Church by a distinct act of our Lord Jesus Christ. But to believe, as has recently been well said by Canon Everest¹ in his admirable essay on the *Gift of the Keys*, that our Lord did provide a visible head for His Church, and that this headship was to be the prerogative of St. Peter's successors; or, with Dr. Döllinger, that a care for the weal of the Church and the duty of watching over the observance of the canons was involved in the gift of the keys to St. Peter, is one thing; to found upon this prerogative a claim for the successive occupants of St. Peter's chair to be the sole fountain of the Episcopate itself, so that every bishop derives his commission and jurisdiction from them, is another. Or, to put it more concisely, as Mr. Gore² states it in his *Roman Claims*, for the successors of St. Peter to be something which other bishops are not, is surely a very different thing from the successors of St. Peter being to other bishops the source of what they are. In regard to the first, Archbishop Bramhall says: 'Concerning order or interior jurisdiction, I know of no controversy between the Church of Rome and us but one—whether the Bishop of Rome alone does derive his jurisdiction *immediately* from Christ, and all other bishops do derive theirs immediately from him.' And so Thorndike: 'I admit,' he says, 'a regular pre-eminence for him [the Pope] above all other bishops (which is seen in the recourse had to him before others in matters concerning the whole Church), but deny that infinite power which nothing can be alleged to prove.' But, indeed, when the Cardinal talks of the constitutional power of the Pope, what difference remains which might not be susceptible of explanation? It is not the constitutional claims of the Pope, as possessing a primacy by our Lord's own appointment, which the English Church rejects, but the apparent stretching of this power so as to absorb the independent rights of the Episcopate, and reduce them to mere representatives of the Pope. Assure

¹ Rev. William Frederick Everest, Canon of Truro, the author of the *Gift of the Keys and other Essays*, 1895.

² Rev. Charles Gore, Canon of Westminster, December 1894, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, translated to Birmingham 1903, and to Oxford in 1911.

us that this is not the case, and that in the domain of doctrine the separation which some have thought was asserted by the Vatican Council to exist between the Pope and the rest of the Episcopate, so that the former could act without the latter, is no part of the teaching of the Roman Church, and you have gone a long way towards laying the foundation which Cardinal Vaughan has told us is necessary for reunion.

About the same time, at the wish of the Pope and Cardinal Rampolla, the Abbé Portal was transferred by his superiors to Paris, in order that he might be enabled to devote himself entirely to the work he had taken up. In the month of October an association for promoting the purpose of the work of reunion, with a monthly paper, was established, and in the December of the same year the first number of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* made its appearance.

In February 1896 I was in Paris for a few days, where I had the opportunity of seeing, at an informal meeting organised by the Abbé Portal, some of the leading clergy and laity. A memorandum giving the names of those present and an account of what passed will be found in the correspondence. I will only mention here that amongst those present were the Duc de Broglie and the Comte de Richemont, Mgr. d'Hulst, and many of the professors of the Catholic Institute, the Abbé Boudinhon, M. Fonsegrive, M. Viollet, and other members of the Institut de France, the editors of all the leading ecclesiastical papers, the Abbé Batiffol, etc., etc., and generally, the leading representatives of ecclesiastical thought in Paris.

Mgr. d'Hulst began the conversation by saying they had come for an interchange of ideas for information, and to express their sense of all that was being done in England in behalf of the great cause of the reunion of Christendom. He then alluded to the prospect of reunion, to the difficulties which beset the question, and to the hopes that might be entertained in regard to it : he spoke of the discussion going on as to the validity of English Orders, of the opposition which the possibility of such recognition seemed to excite amongst members of the Roman Catholic

Communion in England, and he asked whether this opposition was due to the fear entertained that such recognition would interfere with individual conversions, such conversions seeming, as Cardinal Vaughan had apparently stated, to be the only way in which reunion was likely to be brought about. I replied by saying that to look to individual conversions as the means of bringing England back to Catholic unity was tantamount to saying such a restoration to unity was hopeless ; that if England was to be brought back into communion with the Holy See, this would only be done through the Church of England, and that, great as the difficulties were in the way of peace, difficulties which, from a human point of view, might seem insurmountable, I believed peace was possible without compromise of principle on either side, if both sides desired it, and were prepared to allow a wide latitude as to everything not strictly *de fide*, about which, of course, there could be no compromise, though there might be explanations. I begged those present to believe that in bringing forward the question of Orders there had been no desire to strengthen the position of the Church of England as against Rome, but that the question had been brought forward because it afforded a convenient and easy ground upon which to inaugurate discussions and conferences which should have the reunion of Christendom for their object.

I have alluded to what passed at Paris, for it can hardly be doubted that if such conferences could have been brought about between competent theologians on either side, and if sufficient time had been given to allow men's minds to get accustomed to the idea of peace, a great step might have been taken in the direction of reunion. Indeed, for a moment it seemed as if something would be done immediately towards the realisation of such a hope. On the 3rd March the Pope, in a public allocution, had expressed himself in words which could not fail to touch all hearts :—

Anxious to do all in our power to inaugurate still greater schemes for the reunion of those members of the Christian family who, whether in East or West, are separated from us, our

whole heart and soul goes out towards them in a sacred vision of peace. It is Christ the Redeemer, Himself, to Whom are known the times and seasons propitious for such attempts, Who urges us forward. The love of Christ constrains us. It is He, the Good Shepherd, the Prince of the shepherds of His flock, Whose example we so earnestly desire to follow by striving each day with increasing eagerness to promote the accomplishment of the prayer which was the last bequest of His love. Although it may not be granted to us to see the complete realisation of our desires, we have the intimate conviction that at no distant period those desires will be realised, under the guidance of God over-ruling to that end all human affairs. For us it is no small thing to have been allowed to sow the seed of so blessed a peace. . . . And we pray from the bottom of our heart that it may please our Heavenly Father of His infinite mercy to allow nothing to interfere with the work we have set ourselves to accomplish, or to mar the peaceful development of His own kingdom upon earth.

Early in 1896 it was announced that the Pope had determined to appoint a commission to investigate the question of English Orders, and in the middle of March, Mgr. Gasparri,¹ Professor of Canon Law at Paris, was summoned to Rome to take part in the inquiry.

On arriving in Rome Mgr. Gasparri found that Canon Moyes, Dom Gasquet, and the Franciscan Father David Fleming, who had been sent to Rome by Cardinal Vaughan with a long case adverse to the claims of the English Church, together with the Abbé Duchesne and Padre de Augustinis, a Jesuit professor at the Roman College, who, in a formal opinion asked for by the Pope, had pronounced for the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church,² were to be on the Commission. Later, Father Scannell, and Father José Calasanzio de Llevaneras, a Spanish Capucin, were added to their number.

Mgr. Gasparri, however, was a canonist and theologian rather than a historian, and the Abbé Duchesne was more conversant with the history of the first eight centuries than

¹ Now Cardinal.

² An abstract of this opinion is published in Mr. Lacey's *Roman Diary*, pp. 42-46.

with that of the sixteenth. It was obvious, therefore, how important it was in the interests of truth that they should be supplied with full information as to the facts of the case, and this was emphasized by a request from Mgr. Gasparri to be allowed to communicate with Mr. Lacey, one of the authors of the *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, 'by telegraph,' as to any points of special historical knowledge he might require in the course of his inquiry. It was arranged, in consequence, that Father Puller of the Society of St. John the Evangelist from Cowley, and the Rev. T. A. Lacey, should go to Rome for this purpose.

Other influences, however, were already making themselves felt in Rome. No one who is acquainted with the history and the internal condition of the Church of England, its lack of discipline, and the parties which divide it, can doubt that it is easy to make such a *prima facie* case against its claims as may cause any hope of corporate reunion to seem an idle and mischievous dream. It was said that Cardinal Vaughan had expressed the opinion that 'corporate reunion' meant 'corporate confusion' and it must be admitted that the line taken by such members of the Church of England as the Archdeacon of Liverpool¹ played only too well into the hands of those whose horizon was limited by the desire for individual conversions. A paper circulated among the cardinals by Canon Moyes and Dom Gasquet² at the close of the commission, as to the condition of the English Church, gave expression to what was being represented in Rome as the truth about the Anglican Communion. The more favourable opinion and wider hope must have gradually receded before the instances of those whose object it was to impress the authorities at Rome with the hopeless condition of the English Church, and the mischievous results of the attempts at peace encouraged in the first instance by the Pope, and promoted by the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. It was, no doubt, owing to such influences that the idea of friendly conferences on disputed points in accordance with the letter of Cardinal Rampolla in 1894—

¹ The Ven. W. F. Taylor.

² *Riposta all' opuscolo intitolato : De Re Anglicana.*

afterwards endorsed by the Archbishop of York¹—was abandoned, that no Anglicans were allowed to take part in the discussion, and that Dom Gasquet was enabled to say (if the correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* then at Rome is to be trusted), that the question of Anglican Ordinations was one purely internal to the Roman Church, and that the Commission then beginning its discussion was about to meet in order merely to discuss afresh some of the conditions of admission applicable to English clergymen who wished to become priests.

Obviously, the course taken was not the one which had been suggested. Instead of conferences on which both sides would have been represented, a commission had been appointed composed exclusively of theologians in communion with Rome. Further, the question, instead of being considered as a point on which both sides could be brought into contact with a view to future discussions in the interests of peace, was being limited to a mere investigation into the validity of English Orders, from the point of view of the internal discipline of the Roman Church. The change at Rome from what had been originally intended was unmistakable.

As to what actually passed within the Commission itself, it may be difficult to come to an exact conclusion,² but circumstances within the knowledge of every one make certain assertions probable. In the first place it seems established that a considerable part of the time of the Commission was taken up with the consideration of the historical question. This may be gathered from the reference to Father Puller and Mr. Lacey for facts and information on the points under discussion. The question arises whether, in the time that remained before the close of the Commission, the Rite was ever submitted to serious inquiry. It may be assumed that the question of the Rite was discussed in general, that is to say, that the Commission discussed what were the essentials for a valid ordination, but there can also,

¹ Letter to the Abbé Portal, dated 27th March 1896, sent to Cardinal Rampolla.

² The members of the Commission are said to have been bound to secrecy for some years.—*Leaves from My Diary*, by Abbot Gasquet, p. 62.

I think, be little doubt that the fuller and more exact information as to the history of the sixteenth century and the theological opinions current at the time, necessary for the full elucidation of the English Rite, was lacking in the case of those members of the Commission who were the most inclined towards a decision in favour of the sufficiency of the Rite by which orders are conferred in the English Church. Father Puller's very careful treatise on the whole subject, to which the Archbishop of York had written a prefatory letter, had not, I believe, been read by the Abbé Duchesne. That this was the case may be inferred both from general considerations and more particularly from the fact that scarcely any information on the subject of the Rite or of the intention was asked for from Father Puller or Mr. Lacey. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact which seems to be definitely ascertained, that no fresh light was thrown upon the Rite during the sessions of the Commission, it seems impossible to suppose that men like Padre de Augustinis and Abbé Duchesne, who had expressed their opinion in favour of the validity of English Orders, and Mgr. Gasparri, who held them at worst to be doubtful, should in the Commission have decided for their certain invalidity. Consequently, their conclusions could not preclude the continuance—had the wish been there—of the friendly action in the interests of peace which had been inaugurated in the first instance.

How little that wish existed may be inferred from the *Riposta*,¹ circulated by Canon Moyes and Dom Gasquet amongst the Cardinals in answer to Mr. Lacey's pamphlet *De Re Anglicana* ² (already alluded to), the object of which was to impress the authorities in Rome with the hopeless condition of the English Church, and with the mischievous results of the attempts at peace encouraged by the Pope, and to persuade them that the only object of the movement was to secure the recognition of English Orders, without any intention or wish to work further for unity.

The conclusions and memoranda of each member of the

¹ See p. 360.

² *A Roman Diary*, Rev. T. A. Lacey, pp. 210-239.

Commission were referred about the 8th of June to a commission of Cardinals, who were allowed a month to consider the question. Was any real discussion of the English Rite allowed by this Second Commission? Was the decision of 1704 given in Gordon's case, denying its validity, allowed to be re-opened? A doubt may be permitted on the subject in view of the opinions held by an influential school of Roman theology in reference to the decisions of the Holy Office. It will be remembered what appeared in the *Tablet* of 12th June 1897, in reference to the decision of the Holy Office in regard to the text of the Three Witnesses in the Epistle of St. John (1 St. John v. 7). It was said that the decision, not having been pronounced on a Thursday Session of the Holy Office presided over by the Pope, was no final and definitive sentence. On the principle here implied, the sentence of Clement xi. in the case of Gordon, concerning the English Rites of Ordination, which was so pronounced,¹ would be considered by the theologians of this school a final and definitive sentence; indeed, the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* itself says so: 'Every one must see that the question raised in our time had long before been definitely decided by the sentence of the Apostolic See.'²

It would result from this that even if the members of the Commission in the course of the discussion expressed any opinion as to the rite, there could be no real and free discussion of a question which was held to have been definitely settled already, and, in the opinion of some, not open to reconsideration.

¹ Just before the Commission met, all documents bearing on the attitude of the Roman authorities towards English Orders, which were found in the archives of the Inquisition, were collected and were put at the disposition of the members of the Commission. Dom Gasquet and his friends discovered among them certain documents hitherto unknown, which showed that in the Gordon case in the time of Clement xi., the question of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the rite had been considered. Hitherto it had been supposed that the decision in that case had been based solely on the Nag's Head fable, which had been emphasized by Bishop Gordon in his petition to the Pope. The fact that Clement's decision was based, not only on historical, but also on theological grounds, was found very helpful by those who advocated an adverse decision.

² 'Non videt nemo controversiam temporibus nostris exsuscitatam Apostolicæ Sedis judicio definitam multo antea fuisse.'—Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*.

On the 16th July 1896 the Commission of Cardinals was convoked: the question was put, and the reply was that they were all agreed that the question had already been ascertained and determined by the Apostolic See, and that the result of the inquiry brought out clearly with how much wisdom and justice the Apostolic See had definitely decided the question.

The event was in harmony with the wishes of the Roman Catholic authorities in England. Meanwhile the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, dealing with the relations of the Pope to the Church, had appeared in the last days of June, and three months later the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, declaring English Orders invalid, was published. An abstract of the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, as of the Pope's previous letter *Ad Anglos*, was published in the *Times*, with a covering letter from Cardinal Vaughan, and commented upon in an article of that journal of the same complexion as that which had performed a similar office for the Pope's previous letter *Ad Anglos*. The inspiration to which the article was due was obvious, although Cardinal Vaughan's biographer speaks of it as a 'comment' written from the 'opposite pole' to that of an article 'to the same effect' which appeared in the *Tablet*, the Cardinal's own paper.¹ As in the case of the letter *Ad Anglos*, if the wish had been to make the Encyclical unacceptable in England, to prevent any consideration of the claims advanced in it, and to check all attempts at reunion, nothing could have been more calculated to produce such results than the way in which it was presented to the English people. And yet, the Encyclical in itself, apart from the prejudice with which it had been invested, contained statements which had great need to be considered by the English Church, and which might, under happier and more friendly auspices, have promoted the interests of peace. It claimed for the Pope, in relation to the Episcopate, neither less nor more than the rights conferred by our Lord on St. Peter in reference to the other Apostles. It asserted for the Episcopate a power and

¹ *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 191.

jurisdiction¹ derived from Christ, and it defined the rights enjoyed by the Holy See on the one side, and those enjoyed by the Episcopate on the other, by a reference to the names of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, and of other Fathers, citing their authority and practice in witness of the rights recognised from the earliest times as inherent alike in the Episcopate at large, and in the See of Peter.

In face of such a claim as this there might indeed be difficulties in regard to the consequences of our Lord's commission, there could be none as to the principle asserted in itself ; indeed, the Archbishop of York, in a letter to the Abbé Portal of the 27th March, had distinctly said :—

In respect to our relations with the Church of Rome, while it is absolutely vain to expect that England would ever accept the idea of the Papacy as we have been accustomed to have it presented to us, we could never hesitate to admit whatever can be shown to be in accordance with the Will of our Blessed Lord and the teaching of the Primitive Church. It is in this spirit, that we should welcome any opportunities of 'friendly conference' (the words of Cardinal Rampolla), which might tend to bring about a better understanding between us on the basis of St. Augustine's rule, 'in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.'

Considerations such as these, however, in view of the use made of the Encyclical and the meaning attached to it, were not likely to obtain a hearing at the moment, although the reception given to the speech delivered by the Abbé Portal at a meeting of those interested in reunion, in London, on the 14th July, showed how much might have been done under other circumstances, that is to say, had the authorities of the Roman Catholic body in England been anxious to facilitate instead of to prevent explanations, and wise enough to see what an opportunity was being afforded for removing the misunderstandings which keep England and Rome apart.

A full account of the Abbé Portal's speech, which was

¹ A bishop's jurisdiction is of divine right—how it is conferred upon him, whether mediately or immediately, is a question of the Schools.

delivered with the object of removing misconceptions and placing the Encyclical in a favourable light before all who were interested in reunion, together with the events to which it led, will be found in the correspondence. The account of that speech published in the *Tablet*, though taken from the report in the *Guardian*, for the accuracy of which I was responsible, omitted everything connected with the Encyclical, everything relating to the prerogatives of the Holy See. Those portions only were retained which dealt with individual conversions, and which, separated from the parts suppressed, were susceptible of, and indeed suggested, an entirely false impression. The object of such suppression was obvious: it was to further the efforts which were being made to put a stop to the Abbé Portal's work.

Those efforts were only too successful. The Abbé on his return to Paris received an order to abstain from taking any further part in the movement for reunion. I wrote to Cardinal Parocchi, then secretary to the Holy Office, to explain how the Abbé was being misrepresented. I also wrote to Cardinal Rampolla in the same sense, adding in one of my letters that if Rome was opposed to all attempts at corporate reunion, and was looking only to individual conversions, it was the stultification of all that I had been doing, and that, without the formal contradiction of such being the case, I should consider it inconsistent with my whole position to continue the action in which I had been engaged.

To this the Cardinal replied that it was not true to say that Rome only desired individual conversions, and did not desire corporate reunion: that I was not to be discouraged but on the contrary to persevere in my good intentions, and to continue working for that reunion which is so desirable. If Cardinal Rampolla, who had not been present at the meeting of Cardinals on 16th July,¹ was aware of the forthcoming Papal decision, his letter was a proof how little the convictions of English Churchmen as to the reality of the Sacraments conferred by the Church of England and

¹ When the Orders were disallowed.

their loyalty to the *Ecclesia Anglicana* were understood at Rome.

The Bull *Apostolicae Curae* declaring English Orders null and void was published in September. A letter from Lady Beauchamp and a telegram in the newspapers announced the rumoured contents of the Bull, and in a letter to the Abbé, dated 19th September, I said : ‘ If the news which reaches me is correct, our work is finished. The Cardinal, Canon Moyes, and Dom Gasquet triumph. There are victories worse than defeats, and this is one. It is the history of Galileo over again ! ’ A day or two after, having heard from the Abbé, I wrote again :—

It was indeed the love of souls that inspired us. We wished for nothing else. That something should be attempted to put an end to the divisions which separate those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, those divisions which keep so many souls away from Him, that the love of those who already love one another should be increased by being able to communicate at the same altars, that the essential unity of the Church should be recognised by all, and that for these objects we should approach one another in a spirit of love and charity, and in a spirit of penitence for all the faults committed on both sides : that was what we wished. I suppose others wished it too. But to accomplish such an object much love, the charity which hopeth all things, believeth all things, was necessary : it is precisely that which has been wanting. It is difficult to speak without having seen the text of the Bull, but if it is all that is said, it fulfils all the wishes of Cardinal Vaughan and those who have worked with him. As for us, what have we to reproach ourselves with ? We tried to do that which I believe God inspired us to do. We have failed, at least for the moment : but if what we aimed at is God’s Will, that Will will be accomplished in His own good time.

The Archbishop of York begs me to thank you for all that you have done—he says nothing can undo what has been accomplished, and that we must have patience and God will bring all these things to a good end.

The issue of the Bull, contrasting as it did in so marked a way with what had been understood to be the Pope’s original wishes, together with the cessation of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, the editors of which found themselves

compelled to suspend its publication, extinguished the hopes which had done so much to brighten the future, and from which, for a moment, so much had been expected.

Owing to the death of Archbishop Benson, the answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Bull was delayed for some months. It appeared in the early part of 1897, and was followed by a letter from the Pope to the Archbishops, and by a vindication of the Bull by Cardinal Vaughan and the Roman Catholic bishops in England. I add Appendices containing extracts of letters and documents to complete the narrative, but the history of the events detailed in these pages may end here: it is the story of a failure, and certainly, so far as those who had endeavoured to approach the Holy See in the interests of peace were concerned, no failure could well have been more complete. Everything that had been said by the enemies of Rome appeared to be justified, everything that had been urged by those who had desired to see the renewal of the ancient relations between England and Rome seemed to be falsified. Members of the English Church had shown themselves desirous of doing all in their power to heal the divisions of Christendom, conferences on disputed points had been suggested, the principle of such conferences had been accepted, and then, after all the good-will manifested, a deliberate affront had been offered to the English Church, and the very subject selected as the best to inaugurate a series of conferences in the interests of peace had been decided without any conference, in an adverse sense, and used to increase the estrangement which there had been so earnest a wish to remove. But God's ends are accomplished as much by our failures as by our successes. His hand is surely visible in the history of these four years, and if that work was undertaken at His inspiration, its realization is assured.

It was in conversations between two individuals brought together by what we call accident, for reasons of health, neither of them possessing any particular influence, and incapable themselves of influencing the action of Popes, Cardinals, and Archbishops that the seed was sown which

produced what had not happened for more than three centuries, letters from the Pope to England, and communications between the Pope and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. How much might have resulted from those communications if the inspirations of goodwill had been better attended to, if personal considerations had been allowed less place, if there had been a greater desire to make the best of all that might lead to peace, if there had been more charity and a wider outlook on one side, more courage and a greater grasp of principle, a little more imagination, and some perception of how great an opportunity was being missed on the other, the narrative of what occurred may perhaps show. The object sought to be achieved was not to be dismissed because, from a human point of view, the difficulties in the way of its accomplishment might seem to be insuperable: it was essentially an object which could not rightly be approached except in the light of supernatural faith, and in the conviction that with God nothing is impossible. If Cardinal Vaughan had thrown himself into the Pope's views with the same ardour and determination as inspired his efforts to build St. Joseph's College and the Westminster Cathedral, instead of endeavouring, as he certainly did, to thwart those views; if he had not approached the subject of reunion with a preconceived idea of the Church of England, which enabled a distinguished convert to say that of the internal affairs of the Church of England the Cardinal was absolutely ignorant, the story I have to tell might have been very different, and Cardinal Vaughan might have gone down to history as he who above all others had done most to bring England back into communion with the Holy See. But great as the Cardinal's virtues were—and how great they were no one who has read his life can doubt—he did not possess the gift of seeing a position which was not his own from, so to speak, the inside. And in this case the result was that he defeated his own objects. His action was determined by the fear of checking individual conversions: the result of what he did was actually to check them. It was, perhaps, his misfortune rather than his fault, but that he made a great mistake, even from his own

point of view, I can have no doubt. What he believed to be the welfare of souls was at stake, and he acted in regard to that supreme end very much as he acted—from not dissimilar reasons—in regard to Dr. Newman and the Vatican Council: in that case he suppressed in the *Tablet* any allusion to the attitude of the minority; in this, his influence with the press enabled him to present the documents emanating from Rome in such a way as to put them in the most unfavourable light before those they were intended to influence. May his present prayers within the veil correct the result of whatever mistakes may have been made by him and others here below; if the record of those mistakes can help to prevent their repetition in any future attempt to promote the reunion of Christendom, the work the Abbé Portal and I attempted will not have been in vain.

In this connection I cannot forbear quoting the following words addressed in the year 1868 to the then reigning Pontiff by a dignitary of the English Church:—

‘Upon you, Holy Father, more than upon any other human being rests at this moment the hope of peace and unity for the family of Christ on earth. Right and reason are on your side in undertaking this work of reconciliation; mercy and truth meet together to cheer and aid you; the tide and current of public feeling, the progress of events in the world, the yearning desires of true Christians are all with you, the hearts of thousands so long estranged from one another will bless you for promoting their reunion in Christian brotherhood. The Saviour, Who prayed that His followers might all be one in Him, will forward your endeavours; upon you will rest the benediction of the Prince of Peace.’¹

These are the words of Canon Selwyn, himself an Evangelical, the brother of one of the glories of the English Church, the apostolic Bishop of New Zealand, and of Lichfield. Let us make them our own.

One other point: it is due to the Abbé Portal, in view of

¹ Letter from William Selwyn, Canon of Ely Cathedral, to his Holiness Pius IX., 19th September 1868.

certain things which have been said, that mention should be made of a matter in respect of which it is impossible that I should be silent.

The Abbé Portal has been spoken of as the dupe of my representations in regard to the Church of England—representations which had no foundation in fact—and as a mere instrument in my hands. Nothing can be further from the truth. It is true, no doubt, that the Abbé could not alone have accomplished what was done: he knew nothing of England or the English Church, and it is probable that if he had not had the misfortune, as some may think it, of making my acquaintance, he might never have interested himself as he did in English ecclesiastical affairs, but the determining cause of his action, although I may have influenced its particular direction, was the inspiring influence of Leo XIII. himself, which at that time, and ever since his accession to the pontifical throne, had been making itself felt in a variety of ways throughout the whole of the western world, and more especially in France. That influence was nowhere more marked than in the impulse it gave to the cause of reunion. The Encyclical *Præclara*, addressed to the Princes and Peoples of Europe, had made an appeal which awakened a response in many hearts, and the Abbé's action was, in fact, but a part of the general movement which, under the influence of the Pope, was stirring the Church in France. It was a moment when hopes ran high and great enthusiasms had been kindled. In one of his early letters the Abbé says: 'It is not only the East, but those in England and the whole Anglo-Saxon race at our doors . . . : we have to consider them.' And it was under this impulse that he acted. So far from it being the truth that what was attempted had its origin in England, and was due to me, the fact is that the movement had its initiative in France. Beyond an earnest desire for reunion, and a determination never to say a word which might embitter controversy, I had hitherto done little to further the cause I had at heart—the moving impulse came from the Abbé, he was the mainspring of all our action. His compelling energy shook me out of my inaction, and the inspiring

force that urged him forward was due to the quickening impulse given by the attitude of the Pope himself. Whatever may be thought now, under the novel influences which govern the direction of affairs at Rome, no one conversant with the events of that time, the current of opinion then prevalent and the facts of the case, can doubt the truth of this statement, or blame the Abbé's action without also blaming that of Leo XIII.

The Abbé and I worked together, and so far as we were successful, our success was due to the fact that we implicitly trusted one another ; but that the work was attempted at all was due to the Abbé, and to no one else. In the short space of six years, by his courage, his honesty, his skill, his capacity for distinguishing between what is essential and what is not, by his accurate theological knowledge, and by his unrivalled talents, above all, by his love for souls and his devotion to the cause of Christ and His Church, he did more to promote the cause of reunion between England and Rome than has been done by any one, so far as I know, since the schism in the sixteenth century. That work will one day be accomplished, and on that day, when reunion is a fact, and not a hope, the name of the Abbé Portal will be honoured as it deserves.

With so much by way of preface to, and explanation of, the correspondence, I leave that correspondence to tell its own story, merely connecting the letters with such notes and remarks as may be required.

CHAPTER II

LETTERS—1890, 1891, 1892, AND PART OF 1893

THE correspondence which begins with the letters which passed between the Abbé Portal and myself in the summer of 1890, after the Abbé had left Madeira in company with the Bishop of Funchal, for a tour in Italy, is continued throughout the years 1891 and 1892, up to the end of June 1893, and explains the friendship and affection which grew up between us.

It will be seen that we spent some time together in Brittany in 1891, and that in 1892 I paid him a visit at Cahors, where he held the post of Professor of Moral Theology in the Grand Séminaire of Mgr. Grimardias, Bishop of Cahors.

The letters show that the question of reunion was never absent from our thoughts, and bear witness to the fact that far from our having desired to act independently of Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholics, I had in 1892 not only gone to the Cardinal and urged him to take up the cause of reunion himself, but had pointed out to him why, in view of possible conferences for the purpose of mutual explanation, a proposal to discuss the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England was the one most likely to predispose Englishmen to consider favourably all that could be urged on disputed points of doctrine, and on behalf of the claims of the Holy See.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

QUINTA BIANCHI, FUNCHAL, mai 1890.

Un dernier petit mot d'adieu. C'est avec beaucoup de regrets que je verrai le 'Funchal' partir.

Le petit livre sera pour moi un souvenir bien agréable de nos entretiens et de nos promenades.

Priez quelquefois pour moi, que je ne sois pas parmi ceux qui connaissent la vérité, et qui ne la suivent pas.

L'Imitation que vous m'avez donnée me sera toujours chère. Encore, adieu.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax.

VENISE, juillet 1890.

Notre tour d'Italie s'achève, et vraiment c'est fort heureux, car depuis trois jours nous avons de très fortes chaleurs. Que vous dire de cet incomparable pays sinon que je m'en vais enthousiasmé de toutes les beautés que j'y ai vues. Pour mon goût personnel, je retrancherais bien un bon nombre d'Italiens qui ont le don de m'agacer, mais, puisque le soleil a des taches, l'Italie peut bien avoir ses cicéroni, ses facchini, etc., etc. A Rome j'ai eu le bonheur d'assister au consistoire, et surtout d'être reçu par le pape. Léon XIII. m'a émerveillé par sa mémoire surprenante, par sa vive intelligence et par sa présence d'esprit. Il m'a cité des faits d'il y a vingt ans se rapportant à notre congrégation, avec noms propres et circonstances particulières qui m'ont bien surpris. De l'avis de tout le monde, le pape, tout maigre et tout vieux qu'il est, est encore plein de vie.

Nous avons quitté Rome le 11 juillet, depuis lors nous n'avons fait que courir :—Lorette, Assise, Florence, Bologne, Padoue, et Venise—nous sommes aujourd'hui le 19 ! Que de belles choses à Florence, et dire que nous l'avons visitée en deux jours !

Je me suis bien souvent demandé en parcourant cette vraie capitale de l'Italie moderne pourquoi les grands politiques veulent à tout prix Rome pour capitale. Il me semble que seulement au point de vue de l'esthétique cela jure, qu'on passe du Colisée ou des catacombes ou du forum ou de la villa Adrien sur le Corso, et que là on aperçoive le 'high-life' italien—et on éprouve une commotion, le sentiment d'un horrible anachronisme.

J'ai assisté à la fête de St. Jean et à la fête de St. Pierre, c'est fort beau, comme musique.

Une petite excursion à Naples m'a permis de faire l'ascension du Vésuve ; mais je m'aperçois que je vais être au bout de mon papier : permettez-moi, en terminant, de vous demander une lettre, car il me tarde beaucoup d'avoir de vos nouvelles. Comment va votre cher malade ? Ecrivez-moi à Paris, rue de Sèvres

95, et dites-moi que ma dernière ¹ lettre ne vous a pas fait de la peine.

Suivant ma promesse, j'ai dit la Sainte Messe à votre intention et j'ai prié pour vous dans plusieurs de nos sanctuaires.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, 26 juillet 1890.

Je suis tout honteux quand je me rappelle que depuis un mois entier je suis en Angleterre, et que de tout ce temps-là je ne vous ai pas écrit le moindre petit mot—le fait est que j'ai été accablé d'affaires, et puis, nous avons été très inquiets au sujet de mon fils. Il a été souffrant au moment de notre arrivée, les médecins ne m'ont pas beaucoup rassuré, et je ne pouvais m'occuper de rien autre que de sa santé, et de ce qu'il y avait à faire pour l'améliorer. Maintenant, grâce à Dieu, il s'est remis un peu, et si ce progrès dure, nous allons faire un petit voyage en mer. C'est le conseil des médecins, et je ne songe à autre chose qu'à me soumettre à leur avis.

J'ai trouvé nos affaires ecclésiastiques assez tranquilles. Le procès de l'Evêque de Lincoln traîne en longueur. On dit maintenant que le Primat ² ne prononcera aucun jugement avant le mois d'octobre. J'ai rencontré sa Grandeur l'autre jour chez le Lord Mayor, mais je n'ai pas poussé l'audace au point de lui demander des renseignements. C'est bien sûr aussi qu'il ne m'en aurait pas donné.

J'ai promis de faire un discours à un congrès qui se tient à Hull, ville voisine d'ici, sous la présidence de l'Archevêque d'York, au mois d'octobre, et si la sentence est rendue, ce discours aura peut-être quelque importance. Dans ce cas, je vous en enverrai la traduction.

Voici votre lettre qui m'arrive de Venise. Comment pouvez-vous croire, mon cher ami, que votre dernière lettre m'ait fait de la peine ? C'est, je vous l'assure, tout le contraire ; je vous suis bien reconnaissant de toutes les bontés que vous avez eues pour moi. Je devine aisément quels sont les souhaits que vous devez faire pour moi. Il faut bien que ce soit ainsi. De mon côté, vous savez où je suis.

'La Monarchie Pontificale' ³ me paraît remplie de difficultés. Mais, assez pour le moment sur ces sujets. Je suis tout à fait

¹ In which he had spoken of his wishes for my 'conversion' and of 'La Monarchie Pontificale.'

² Archbishop Benson.

³ The work of Dom Guéranger.

de votre avis sur la question de la capitale de l'Italie. On aurait dû prendre Florence. Rome pour mille raisons est une ville à part.

Combien de temps restez-vous à Paris ? Retournez-vous à Madère ? Est-ce qu'il y a le moindre espoir de vous voir en Angleterre ? Si seulement vos supérieurs voulaient vous permettre de passer quinze jours chez nous au mois de septembre ! Pensez-y bien, mon cher ami, et songez au bien immense que vous me feriez.

Toutes vos sollicitudes et toutes vos prières, surtout les Messes que vous avez dites à mon intention dans de si saints lieux, me touchent profondément.

Adieu, mon cher ami, vos lettres sont toujours un bonheur pour moi.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

MALAGA, ESPAGNE, 6 septembre 1890.

Je suis encore de ce monde, et je viens vous donner signe de vie.

De Venise, nous sommes allés à Milan où nous avons vu les Capranica.¹ Le pauvre vieux marquis est bien affaibli, et la marquise a beaucoup de cheveux blancs : la douleur est passée par là, bien amère. De Milan à Turin, de Turin à Lyon, et de Lyon à Paris.

Le 6 août mon supérieur m'annonçait que je ne rentrais ni à Madère, ni en Portugal, et le 7 Mgr.² prenait avec un autre confrère le chemin de Bordeaux. Ce n'est pas sans émotion que je me suis séparé de ce bon et saint évêque, qui m'avait procuré une de mes plus grandes jouissances. Lui aussi a été bien ému quand il m'a donné sa dernière bénédiction.

Quand il a fallu statuer sur mon sort, j'entrevoyais avec joie une classe de théologie dans un séminaire du midi de la France qui me convenait à ravir. Je comptais sans mon hôte. Le docteur a déclaré qu'il m'était impossible de reprendre tout de suite le professorat et alors on a été bien embarrassé de ma personne. On m'a envoyé, en attendant une solution définitive, donner des retraites en Espagne, où je suis déjà venu l'année dernière.

Vous constaterez donc, mon cher ami, que, malgré toutes nos

¹ Friends of the Abbé Portal, whose acquaintance I had made in Madeira. They had lost their daughter.

² The Bishop of Funchal.

charmantes promenades,¹ je ne suis pas tout à fait guéri de ma congestion. Vous avez échoué, j'ai un plaisir cruel à vous le dire, puisque moi, de mon côté, j'ai fort peu réussi.² Cependant le docteur a constaté une grande amélioration, et vous ? . . . Je pense qu'il faudra recommencer le traitement. Comme volontiers je reprendrais n'importe où nos bonnes promenades et nos délicieuses causeries.

J'ai appris avec peine la mort du cardinal Newman. C'est une perte pour l'Eglise d'Angleterre sous bien des rapports : vous le savez mieux que moi.

J'espère que vous voudrez bien me tenir au courant du mouvement des idées religieuses autour de vous, et je compte en particulier sur votre discours, que vous avez bien voulu me promettre. Ne vous donnez pas la peine excessive de le traduire, je me ferai rendre ce service par n'importe qui autour de moi.

Et votre cher malade, comment va-t-il ?

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

MADRID, HÔPITAL FRANÇAIS,
14 octobre 1890.

C'est dans la province de Jaen, au moment où je montais en voiture pour commencer mon voyage de retour à Madrid, que j'ai reçu votre si courte et si triste lettre.³

Quelle épreuve pour vous, mon cher ami, et pour Lady Halifax, et pour tous les vôtres. Votre cœur si affectueux a dû être brisé. Mon Dieu, que la mort est bien plus terrible lorsqu'elle frappe ainsi les êtres qui nous sont chers. Vous avez déjà trop vécu, mon cher ami, vous avez trop souffert aussi, pour n'avoir pas dit quelquefois comme St. Paul, 'me taedet vivere,' et si la mort venait vous frapper vous la recevriez comme un vrai chrétien, sans trop de peur, ni de regrets. Mais donner ses enfants ! Dans mon ministère, mon cher ami, moyennant la grâce de Dieu, je sais faire accepter la mort, mais consoler un père ou une mère je ne l'ai jamais su. Il n'y a pour vous qu'un consolateur, le Dieu du Calvaire et de la souffrance. Souvenez-vous qu'au pied de la croix Jésus a voulu qu'il y eût une mère et dites dans votre douleur ces belles strophes 'Stabat mater dolorosa,' etc.

Mes prières ne vous manqueront pas. Hier j'ai dit la Sainte

¹ I used to persuade him to take walks with me for the sake of his health.

² In the matter of my conversion.

³ The death of my son.

Messe pour votre cher enfant, et j'ai bien prié pour vous ; je continuerai, mon cher ami. Je voudrais bien vous voir en ce moment si triste. Les amitiés ne vous manquent pas sans nul doute, mais c'est une privation pour moi de ne pas vous donner mon petit tribut d'encouragement. Si je rentrais en France, ce qui est à peu près sûr, est-ce que nous ne pourrions pas nous rencontrer à Paris dans quelques mois ? Je serais si heureux de passer une huitaine de jours dans notre Maison-mère : le calme religieux auprès des reliques de St. Vincent, huit jours de solitude et d'édification chrétienne vous feraient, je crois, grand bien.

Je vous ferai adresser de Paris, un tout petit livre, que vous offrirez de ma part à Lady Halifax, si vous le jugez à propos.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, STAMFORD BRIDGE,

14 novembre 1890.

Votre bonne lettre m'a fait du bien, et je vous en suis très reconnaissant.

Notre Seigneur est si bon pour nous que ce serait la pire ingratitude de ne pas accepter tout ce qui vient de lui avec la plus profonde conviction que tout est pour le mieux, et pour nous, et pour ceux qui nous sont si chers, et c'est ce que je tâche de faire. Après tout, ce n'est pas si difficile de croire que Notre Seigneur en sait plus long que nous, sur ce qui se rattache à notre salut ; et si ces épreuves nous sont nécessaires, il faut essayer de les accepter avec joie.

Quand on songe à ses péchés ce serait quelque chose d'épouvantable de n'avoir que les douceurs de la vie ; on se croirait abandonné comme ceux pour qui on ne peut rien.

Depuis que je vous ai écrit, Lady Halifax est tombée malade. Elle a eu une fièvre typhoïde, et depuis un mois elle est au lit. Grâce à Dieu tout va bien, mais il y a quinze jours, j'étais très inquiet, très malheureux. Nous sommes ici au milieu des bois et des collines, une vraie solitude. En dehors du médecin, des gardes-malades, et du curé, je ne vois personne. Je monte beaucoup à cheval, je fais beaucoup de lectures et je ne regrette pas d'être tout seul : une chose me ferait plaisir, c'est que vous fussiez ici.

Il n'y a rien de nouveau en ce qui touche nos affaires ecclésiastiques. Je crois que l'évêque de Lincoln sortira triomphant du procès dont nous avons tant parlé.

Depuis que j'ai commencé à vous écrire, le livre¹ est arrivé. Lady Halifax est encore trop malade pour le lire, mais elle est bien touchée de votre bonté pour elle. Ce que j'en ai lu m'a ravi. Pour nous la pensée de la mort, et de tout ce qui, par la miséricorde de Dieu, est au delà de la mort, rapporte plus de consolation que toutes les joies de la terre. Mais, mon cher ami, ne pensez pas que nous sommes malheureux. Dieu a été bien bon pour nous, et tout devient supportable, je dirai presque doux, si on se laisse bien tranquillement dans ses mains.

Comme je vous remercie pour le souvenir que vous avez eu de mon cher enfant à l'autel. Priez pour lui et pour nous.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

BARCELONA, 1890.

Justement j'allais vous écrire lorsque votre lettre m'est arrivée. J'étais inquiet de votre long silence, et je faisais mille suppositions. Mes inquiétudes avaient bien un fondement puisque Lady Halifax a été si malade.

J'ai été bien édifié, mon cher ami, de vos sentiments si profondément chrétiens. N'est-ce pas que lorsqu'on est bien chrétien on trouve tout à fait vraie cette parole de St. Jérôme : 'O mort, tu es noire, mais tu es belle.' Noire, oui, elle l'est par son horrible travail sur le corps, par son triste cortège de souffrances, par les larmes qu'elle arrache à la pauvre nature, par les déchirements des cœurs qu'elle fait saigner. Mais elle est belle parce que, à travers cette hideuse figure on en peut voir une autre qui est bien belle, celle de Jésus Christ qui vient, le divin jardinier, cueillir une âme mûre pour le ciel. Elle est belle parce que la mort n'est pas une fin mais un commencement, et que ses ténèbres ressemblent à celles que l'on voit s'enfuir poursuivies par l'aurore.

Il y a une dizaine années, j'ai été sur le point de partir moi aussi pour le grand voyage, et, depuis lors, bien souvent l'état précaire de ma santé m'a rappelé que je pouvais être frappé d'un instant à l'autre. Cela m'a fait du bien. Sans doute j'ai bien malheureusement expérimenté 'que plus on marche plus on se crotte,' du moins j'en ai tiré un certain détachement qui parfait ma vie religieuse. Aimer le bon Dieu le plus possible, malgré le refroidissement progressif du cœur, faire du bien aux âmes, oh ! beaucoup de bien, et puis cueillir sur la route quelques

¹ *Méditations de l'Abbé Perraud.*

fleurs, c'est-à-dire, aimer ses amis. N'est-ce pas là toute la vie, la vraie vie ?

En attendant, mon cher ami, que notre tour vienne, nous travaillerons à mériter une mort sainte, nous ferons du bien, et nous garderons au cœur cette bonne amitié née là-bas providentiellement.

Mes supérieurs me renvoient dans mon ancienne maison à Cahors en qualité d'économe, et je me permets de vous rappeler une promesse que vous m'avez faite bien souvent ! 'Si vous rentrez dans un grand séminaire de France, soyez sûr que j'irai faire une retraite auprès de vous,' vous en souvient-il ? Donc, je vous attends à Cahors.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, STAMFORD BRIDGE,
YORK, 26th Novr. 1890.

Je lis votre livre pour la seconde fois ; c'est-à-dire que je suis votre conseil.

Ce que vous dites dans votre bonne lettre qui vient d'arriver, va droit au cœur. On est si lâche envers soi-même, qu'en vérité on devrait être bien reconnaissant à Dieu quand il nous envoie des croix. On peut au moins essayer de les accepter sans trop se plaindre, et de remercier Dieu de tout ce qui aide à nous détacher des choses d'ici-bas.

Lady Halifax a été portée pour la première fois hier sur un sofa. Grâce à Dieu, les médecins sont satisfaits, et j'espère maintenant que tout ira bien. Le procès de l'évêque de Lincoln est terminé. Le jugement du Primat donne raison à l'Evêque, et nous sommes très contents. Un des vôtres, qui est très lié avec votre monde en Angleterre, m'écrivit ce matin que rien ne pourrait avoir de meilleurs effets pour la cause dont je vous ai si souvent parlé. C'est bien sûr, mon très cher ami, que je viendrai vous voir à Cahors.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

29 décembre 1890.

Avant que les embarras du premier de l'an m'arrivent, je tiens à vous offrir mes vœux et souhaits de bonne année à vous et à tous les vôtres. Cette année qui s'achève a été bien rude pour vous, mon cher ami, mais je suis sûr qu'au ciel vous la considérerez comme très précieuse, car elle vous aura mérité

beaucoup. Que l'année dans laquelle nous entrons soit pour nous une année de grâces, qu'elle nous apporte aussi, si le bon Dieu le veut, quelques joies de la terre.

Vous me parliez autrefois d'un livre ¹ russe, écrit en français, sur l'église orthodoxe, pourriez-vous m'en donner le titre exact et l'adresse de l'éditeur : je serais très curieux de le lire.

Dans le cas où vous auriez quelque autre indication intéressante, soit sur l'église grecque, soit sur l'église anglaise, même sur des livres écrits en anglais, je l'accepterais avec gratitude, car je me propose d'occuper mes loisirs à cette étude.

The death of Lady Halifax's only brother, the Earl of Devon,² and of Earl Beauchamp,³ early in 1891 interrupted my correspondence with the Abbé.

We were away in May and June, and Lady Halifax was again ordered abroad in July.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

SOUTHAMPTON, 3 juillet 1891.

Je viens d'arriver ici en route pour Roscoff.

Lady Halifax, je l'espère du moins, va un peu mieux, mais le médecin à Londres nous a dit que deux mois auprès de la mer avec des bains de mer chauds lui sont absolument nécessaires. Pour le moment elle n'a pas beaucoup de forces, et il me semble qu'elle est devenue plus maigre encore qu'elle ne l'était avant de prendre les eaux en Allemagne. Tout ceci me rend inquiet, et puis, ces jours-ci me rappellent à chaque instant l'année passée où mon fils était encore avec nous. C'est le cœur bien gros que je vous écris. Toutes mes pensées sont remplies du souvenir de mon enfant. Ici c'est l'endroit où nous avons débarqué en retournant de Madère. Mais à quoi bon vous affliger avec mes tristesses. Elles passeront, et après tout, il faut accepter de bon cœur ce que la volonté de Dieu nous envoie. Jamais je n'aurais le courage de me punir moi-même, aussi forcée est d'être reconnaissant pour les souffrances qui m'arrivent d'autre part.

Je ne sais pas trop de quelle façon nos plans s'arrangeront avant d'arriver à Roscoff, mais je ne crois pas pouvoir quitter

¹ Khomiakoff, *L'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme*.

² Edward Baldwin, twelfth Earl of Devon.

³ Frederick, sixth Earl Beauchamp, who died very suddenly at Madresfield.

Lady Halifax et tout ce monde d'enfants.¹ Quelle bonne chance si le hasard vous envoyait du côté de la Bretagne ! S'il m'est impossible de venir à Cahors maintenant, il faut arranger les choses pour plus tard, en attendant faites-moi savoir vos arrangements.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

CAHORS, 7 juillet 1891.

Je ne saurais vous dire quel plaisir m'a fait votre première lettre surtout, car je ne savais plus que penser. Grâce à Dieu, malgré vos inquiétudes, Lady Halifax est en voie de guérison, vous passerez je l'espère de très bons jours à Roscoff, en cette terre de France sur laquelle j'aurais bien voulu vous recevoir, et vous ramènerez les vôtres en Angleterre pleins de santé. Je comprends toutes vos craintes, comme je comprends votre chagrin en revoyant les lieux qui vous rappellent votre cher enfant ; pourquoi avoir du scrupule à me dire vos tristesses, mon cher ami ? Un de nos auteurs a dit que le moi est haïssable ; j'admets cela pour des personnes qui tout en ayant des relations restent absolument étrangères les unes aux autres, mais entre amis, c'est le moi que je cherche, et que je veux surtout quand il s'agit de tristesses. Vous connaissez cette belle définition de l'amitié : ' nihil aliud est nisi omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum cum benevolentia et caritate summa consensio.' Omnium . . . summa consensio . . . j'ai toujours regretté qu'un païen l'ait trouvée. Croyez, mon cher ami, que vous ne pouvez me donner une meilleure marque d'amitié que de me parler de vous, en particulier lorsque vous êtes dans la peine.

Nous sommes en vacances jusqu'aux premiers jours d'octobre. J'espère que nos projets si bien enterrés par l'influenza seront repris et menés à bonne fin. Il serait triste que nos chers souvenirs de Madère ne puissent pas se renouveler et se rafraîchir.

L'empereur d'Allemagne fait la cour à votre vieille reine ou plutôt à votre flotte. Est-ce vrai, mon cher ami, qu'en cas de guerre vous seriez contre nous, et que si la victoire revenait sous nos drapeaux, il ne nous serait pas possible après avoir battu l'Allemagne d'administrer une belle fouettée à cette Italie dont le rôle à notre égard est ignoble d'ingratitude. J'ai de la peine à croire que votre gouvernement se soit lié, comme j'ai de la peine à croire qu'il veuille l'ancantissement de la France.

Une seule chose me fait plaisir au milieu de tous ces imbroglios, de toutes ces menaces, c'est l'abnégation, l'héroïsme du Pays.

¹ Lady Beauchamp and her children went with us to Roscoff.

Depuis l'homme du peuple le plus humble jusqu'au gentilhomme, à tous les degrés de l'échelle, dès qu'il s'agit de l'armée, on est prêt à tous les sacrifices. Vous avez été le témoin¹ de nos désastres. Après 1871 nous n'avions plus d'armée, aujourd'hui elle est fort belle, et de l'avis de tout le monde une lutte avec l'Allemagne pourrait être affrontée sans trop de crainte. Pour qu'en vingt ans un pays se relève à ce point, il faut qu'il ait dans les veines du bon sang.

En dehors de l'armée, par exemple, la France se paie un luxe de folies peu commun : mais ce chapitre serait trop long. A bientôt de vos nouvelles, mon cher ami, la prochaine fois je vous parlerai de vos ordres, j'ai là-dessus quelques petites remarques que je vous communiquerai.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

CAHORS, 29 juillet 1891.

Il y a bien longtemps, mon cher ami, que je veux vous communiquer quelques réflexions sur la défense de vos ordres, telle qu'elle est présentée par le Rév. Aubrey Moore : ² puisque je ne suis pas trop pressé, je vais le faire aujourd'hui.

On a beaucoup discuté sur le fait, c'est-à-dire, sur la validité de l'ordination de Parker. Sur ce point la discussion me paraît inextricable, et, en définitive, la conclusion vous est favorable, en vertu du principe de droit *melior est conditio possidentis*. Mais il me semble qu'on pourrait avantageusement porter l'attaque sur un autre point. Il faut admettre, dit notre auteur, que Notre Seigneur n'a pas déterminé *in specie* la matière et la forme de tous les sacrements, et qu'il a laissé ce soin à l'Eglise. Parmi les catholiques romains plusieurs théologiens font difficulté d'admettre cette proposition : quant à moi, je la regarde comme certaine et indiscutable. Il suffit d'ouvrir St. Thomas pour constater qu'il place la matière et la forme de la confirmation dans l'onction, alors que les Grecs et les Latins anciennement les mettent dans l'imposition des mains. Or, s'il y a eu changement l'Eglise ne pouvait l'opérer que si la détermination lui a été laissée par Notre Seigneur.

Donc l'Eglise a pu déterminer une autre matière et une autre forme que celles usitées tout d'abord dans le sacrement de

¹ I had been at Sedan with the Red Cross for some time in 1870, attached to one of the hospitals.

² He had been interested in a book by the Rev. Aubrey Moore, which I had sent him amongst others, including Khomiakoffi *Sur l'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme*, above mentioned.

l'Ordre et les déterminer pour la validité et la licéité. Cette conclusion sort tout naturellement, et de la proposition du Rév. Aubrey Moore et de ce que je viens de vous dire.

L'Eglise le peut, cela est certain : mais l'a-t-elle fait, l'a-t-elle voulu ? La volonté de l'Eglise se reconnaît, soit par l'usage que l'on peut constater chez elle, soit par le sentiment unanime des théologiens, lorsqu'il n'y a pas de loi, de commandement expressément formulé. Je ne connais pas d'acte spécial opérant la transformation. Je crois, au contraire, que ce n'est qu'insensiblement qu'une cérémonie regardée comme accidentelle dans le principe, est devenue essentielle chez les Latins. Mais elle a été regardée, et elle est regardée, comme essentielle : cela se prouve, 1°. par l'obligation de *recommencer* l'Ordination si tout, ou partie, de la porrection des instruments a été omise ; 2°. par l'unanimité des théologiens du treizième, quatorzième, et quinzième siècles pour n'admettre comme valide, que la porrection des instruments ; 3°. par l'opinion des théologiens des époques postérieures qui admettent comme nécessaire l'imposition des mains et la porrection des instruments et qui prescrivent si la porrection des instruments a été omise dans une ordination, non pas de suppléer au défaut de ce rite, mais de recommencer l'ordination purement et simplement.

Mais quel est le sujet de la volonté de l'Eglise ? Pour nous qui admettons que Rome est le centre, évidemment c'est l'Eglise romaine, et dans ce cas la question est vidée : mais j'entre dans votre opinion et j'admets, par hypothèse, que l'Eglise grecque, c'est-à-dire, l'Eglise tout entière au moyen âge, doive intervenir, et il me semble que l'on peut raisonner ainsi.

L'Eglise grecque savait très bien, et par notre pratique et par nos documents—en particulier par le décret *ad Armenos*¹—que nous n'avions pas la même matière ni la même forme pour la Confirmation et l'Ordre. L'exemple de la Confirmation est typique, car, si l'imposition des mains a été maintenue chez nous pour l'Ordre, l'onction lui a été substituée dans la Confirmation. Or, l'Eglise grecque a admis nos sacrements. Si elle les a admis, sa volonté s'est unie à celle de l'Eglise romaine. Et l'Eglise entière a donc admis, et par le fait même, déterminé que la porrection des instruments et l'onction constituent une partie essentielle de la Confirmation et de l'Ordre en occident. Cette volonté de l'Eglise Universelle qui admettait dans les deux Eglises des usages différents, a admis que chez les Latins l'onction

¹ Of Eugenius iv.

et la porrection des instruments étaient devenues nécessaires, tandis qu'elles ne l'étaient pas chez les Grecs. Si on admet que l'Eglise a reçu mission de déterminer la matière et la forme de certains sacrements, il faut admettre qu'elle a le pouvoir de changer ce qu'elle a établi : mais il faut admettre aussi, que l'Eglise seule, et non pas une fraction de cette Eglise, a ce pouvoir. Chaque évêque ne peut pas évidemment avoir cette puissance : dès lors, on est en droit de dire aux évêques d'Angleterre, ou, plutôt, à trois ou quatre évêques : Pour supprimer une partie de l'Ordination regardée par tous les théologiens de cette époque, par vous-mêmes avant les troubles, par l'Eglise latine, et—implicitement par l'Eglise grecque—comme essentielles, sur quels droits vous fondez-vous ?

On a inféré de la conduite de ces évêques, qui supprimaient une partie regardée comme essentielle de l'Ordination, qu'ils n'avaient pas voulu véritablement ordonner ; moi, je conclus de ce qui précède que s'ils voulaient, ils ne pouvaient pas ; car il n'appartient pas à un particulier de toucher à la matière ni à la forme des sacrements déterminées par l'Eglise.

Il me semble, mon cher ami, que j'en dis assez pour faire comprendre la portée de mon argumentation, de vous surtout, qui êtes si au courant de ces matières. Vous savez que tout cela est dit *salva amicitia*, et vous savez aussi combien je serais heureux d'avoir votre pensée à ce sujet. Si vous n'avez pas le temps de me l'écrire, vous me l'expliquerez à Cahors.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HÔTEL DES BAINS, ROSCOFF,
FINISTÈRE, 1 août 1891.

J'étais en train de vous écrire quand votre lettre m'est arrivée.

Maintenant, avant de répondre à ce que vous me dites, laissez-moi vous donner de nos nouvelles. Nous sommes vraiment très bien ici. C'est tout à fait une solitude. Personne de notre connaissance, et une plage où les enfants s'amuse du matin au soir. Il serait impossible de mener une vie plus paisible et plus régulière. La haute et la basse marée décident la grande question si nous nous baignons le matin ou l'après-midi, et à quelle heure la promenade aura lieu. Nous allons à la messe à sept heures ; à huit heures moins un quart, le café. Nous déjeunons à onze heures, le dîner est à six heures, et nous nous couchons à neuf heures. Le temps a été superbe, l'air est très fortifiant, et Lady

Halifax va beaucoup mieux. Nous sommes au nombre de vingt-et-un, si on compte les domestiques, et nous remplissons à peu près l'hôtel. M. Séjat, le propriétaire, est très aimable, et le service est suffisamment bien fait. Les fenêtres de l'hôtel donnent d'un côté sur la mer, on pourrait jeter une pierre dans l'eau quand la marée est haute, et de l'autre côté nous sommes vis-à-vis de l'église. En un mot, l'endroit nous va à merveille, et nous serons très fâchés de quitter Roscoff. Nous comptons rester ici jusqu'aux derniers jours du mois, et alors nous passerons par St. Malo pour retourner en Angleterre.

J'ai fait connaissance avec le Recteur dont tout le monde dit du bien, et nous sommes tous très édifiés par les foudres qu'on voit à l'église. C'est tout autre chose qu'à Madère.

Vous allez trouver tout ceci très ennuyeux, mais telle est notre vie, et elle ne se prête pas à une chronique amusante. Maintenant, j'ai une proposition à vous faire. Si vous êtes libre jusqu'à la fin du mois, ne pourriez-vous pas nous faire une petite visite ? Je suis sûr qu'une semaine ou dix jours vous feraient beaucoup de bien. N'hésitez pas, mettez-vous dans le train, et dites-moi tout de suite l'heure de votre arrivée. J'attends votre réponse avec impatience. Qu'elle soit un 'oui' ! Je demande, j'exige un 'oui' ! Si vous venez, nous discuterons le raisonnement que vous m'envoyez sur la question des Ordres. Si vous ne venez pas, je vous écrirai là-dessus à tête reposée, mais il me semble, pour toucher un seul point, qu'au point de vue de l'Eglise romaine, si l'imposition des mains avec l'intention de conférer les Ordres a été considérée comme suffisante pour la validité des Ordres à telle époque dans l'histoire de l'Eglise, il ne devrait pas y avoir de difficulté pour que l'Eglise romaine, vu toutes les circonstances, reconnût la validité de nos Ordres, même en admettant qu'ils eussent dû être conférés avec d'autres cérémonies. 'Fieri non debuit, factum valet.' Adieu.

The Abbé Portal came to Roscoff 20th August, and stayed with us until the 28th, when he accompanied us as far as St. Malo on our way to England. I remember now his astonishment at the number of handbags and loose parcels we had with us, and the shade of something more than astonishment at the noise the children (Lady Agnes and Lady Maud Lygon, and my son Edward) made in the train.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, STAMFORD BRIDGE,
YORK, 12 novembre 1891.

Je suis tout à fait au désespoir. J'avais essayé d'écrire quelque chose pour la *Revue*¹ dont vous m'aviez parlé, mais j'ai trouvé cela si difficile, et le tout m'a paru si banal et si mal fait que j'ai tout déchiré, et c'est à recommencer de nouveau. Je ne sais ce que vous allez me dire, mais je puis vous assurer que ce n'est pas la bonne volonté qui fait défaut. Je suis contrarié au dernier point d'être si absolument idiot. (Je crains aussi qu'une de vos lettres ne se soit égarée.) Que m'avez-vous demandé au sujet des livres de théologie ? Serait-ce par hasard que les volumes que je vous ai expédiés ne sont pas arrivés ? Enfin je n'y comprends rien, ce qui m'ennuie beaucoup, car je ne voudrais pas, pour tout au monde, vous donner des embarras.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

CAHORS, 17 novembre 1891.

En arrivant ici, il y aura demain huit jours, j'ai trouvé votre lettre et les livres que vous avez bien voulu m'envoyer. Les livres constituent un vrai trésor dont je vous suis infiniment reconnaissant. J'ai déjà parcouru de-ci de-là plusieurs de ces ouvrages, je me propose de les travailler à fond, dès que j'aurai repris ma vie de calme et d'ordre.

J'ai reçu une réponse favorable du directeur de la *Science Catholique*. A l'œuvre donc, mon cher ami, et envoyez-moi au plus tôt votre manuscrit. Ce ne sera là, j'espère, que le commencement d'une longue campagne. Que Notre Seigneur bénisse nos efforts, que par sa grâce la petite semence jetée par l'amitié dans le champ de l'Eglise y produise des fruits d'union.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

28 novembre 1891.

Je vous demandais dans ma dernière lettre de vouloir bien reprendre votre travail pour la *Revue*. Je crois, mon cher ami, plus que jamais, qu'il serait bon de faire connaître l'état de votre Eglise ; l'union, si jamais Dieu la permet, ne peut se produire brusquement ; une préparation est nécessaire dans les différentes

¹ *Revue de la Science Catholique*.

communions. Pourquoi ne travaillerions-nous pas de toutes nos forces à préparer ce glorieux événement, en jetant une petite semence de-ci de-là, laissant à Dieu le soin de la faire germer, s'il le juge à propos.

J'attendais votre discours sur le rétablissement des ordres religieux, des détails sur cette réunion, etc. Rien n'est arrivé. Mon cher ami, je ne vous laisserai pas un moment de repos jusqu'à ce que nous ayons commencé notre petite campagne. Je me propose d'entrer en relations avec un de nos principaux journaux religieux, et de lui envoyer des articles dès que j'aurai quelque chose. Je serai sûr, ainsi, que nos idées passeront sous les yeux de nos principaux évêques. Mais il faut que j'aie quelque chose. Cette réunion et la statue¹ du Cardinal Newman fourniraient, je crois, de bons articles : allons, mon cher ami, c'est pour l'Eglise, c'est pour notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, à l'œuvre donc.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HAMPTON COURT PALACE,
12 décembre 1891.

Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa ! C'est le seul mot que je trouve à vous adresser. Vraiment j'ai honte de moi-même, et je veux absolument me confesser. Ce malheureux écrit que je vous avais promis me pesait sur la conscience. C'était si difficile à faire, que je ne trouvais jamais la résolution de me mettre à l'œuvre. Je me faisais des reproches tous les jours, mais il n'en résultait rien, et puis, quand votre dernière lettre m'est arrivée j'avais peur de la lire.

Voyez, mon cher ami, l'indigne personne pour laquelle vous vous donnez tant d'embarras, et comme je mérite peu votre amitié. Maintenant, je vous en prie, pardonnez-moi. Je suis tout contrit, et je vous demande pardon très humblement. Ce qui finit de me couvrir de confusion c'est le ton de votre lettre. Enfin, je vous promets de me mieux conduire à l'avenir. Aussi je vais vraiment essayer de vous envoyer quelque chose pour vos journaux. En y regardant de plus près, ce qui s'est passé à York, au sujet des ordres religieux, ne vaut pas la peine d'être reproduit ; c'était trop *local*, et n'aurait pas beaucoup d'intérêt à l'étranger. Si je peux y mettre la main, je vous enverrai mardi, quand je serai à Londres pour quelques heures,

¹ The erection of a statue in memory of Cardinal Newman : it was eventually put up outside the Oratory at Brompton.

la lettre ¹ à l'archevêque de Paris et sa réponse au sujet des ordres religieux en France.

L'affaire de la statue du cardinal Newman marche bien ; nous attendons seulement la réponse de la municipalité d'Oxford pour la mettre tout à fait en train ; l'argent est prêt, et c'est seulement la question du lieu qui reste à être décidée.

Nos journaux s'occupent de l'archevêque d'Aix, et de la discussion à votre chambre des députés sur l'obligation que votre gouvernement impose à vos évêques de demander une permission pour aller à Rome : cela me paraît quelque chose de tout à fait inouï. Je voudrais que tous les évêques français se missent en pèlerinage 'ad Limina' à l'instant.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

12 janvier 1892.

La soirée est à moi, si vous le voulez bien, nous allons en profiter et jaser tout à notre aise.

Vous m'avez parlé du mois de février pour votre voyage à Cahors, nous voilà au milieu de janvier et déjà vous pouvez prévoir si, oui ou non, vous serez à même d'exécuter votre projet. Je vous en prie, fixez-moi là-dessus. Le mariage du fils du Prince de Galles aurait lieu, d'après les journaux, le 28 février. Cette date, contrarie-t-elle les projets de Lady Beauchamp et de Lady Halifax ?

Et maintenant, causons. J'ai dû pour un renseignement consulter l'histoire du Concile du Vatican, par Mgr. Cecconi, traduite par deux prêtres de Paris, et depuis deux jours je suis absorbé par cet ouvrage que je ne connaissais pas. La facture n'est pas française, mais les jugements me paraissent impartiaux et les documents qu'il publie sont du plus haut intérêt. Tout naturellement, je suis allé, dans les préliminaires, à ce qui concerne votre Eglise, et je ne saurais vous dire à quel point j'ai été intéressé par des extraits d'un opuscule de Cobb : ² 'A few words, etc.', par les tentatives d'un Bollandiste, le père de Buck, et en particulier par sa belle lettre si charitable et si savante, insérée dans le *Church Times*. Il y aura là matière à bonnes conversations. Pour aujourd'hui, laissez-moi vous rappeler

¹ A letter I had written to Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, on behalf of the English Church Union, in regard to the expulsion of the Religious Orders from France.

² Gerald Cobb, the author of the *Kiss of Peace*, and other works in the interests of reunion.

quelques paroles de Cobb : ‘ Nous déclarons posséder des preuves authentiques plus que suffisantes pour faire casser ce verdict au sujet des ordinations. Qu’avons-nous fait pour placer ces preuves sous les yeux de nos adversaires et obtenir qu’ils modifient leur jugement ? . . . La moitié au moins de nos ecclésiastiques s’en félicitent et ne cessent de proclamer que nous sommes une Eglise protestante, les fils du seizième siècle, qui a eu la mission spéciale de commencer contre l’antéchrist papal une guerre qui se poursuivra jusqu’à la fin du monde.’

Si cela est vrai, je me demande au sujet du dernier paragraphe, ce que deviennent vos sacrements en pareilles mains, et si quelques-uns de vos évêques entrent dans ces idées, que peuvent-ils faire du sacrement de l’Ordre ?

Mais, c’est sur la première citation que je veux m’arrêter et avec Cobb je vous dirai : Avez-vous fait quelque chose pour placer ces preuves sous les yeux de votre adversaire ? Votre Eglise devrait publier, si non d’une manière officielle, du moins par l’organe d’un de vos meilleurs théologiens, une thèse établissant péremptoirement la validité de vos ordinations. Et pourquoi ne profiteriez-vous pas du pontificat actuel ? Léon XIII. a l’esprit très large, très conciliant. Il apporterait, j’en suis sûr, dans l’examen de l’opportunité de la question, et de la question elle-même, toute la prudence et la sagesse voulues. Comme le dit très bien Cobb, Rome est au moins le siège de votre patriarche, c’est donc à lui, qu’un litige doit être porté. Croyez, mon cher ami, que ce sera toujours là la première question à résoudre, et elle est d’autant plus facile à aborder que ce n’est qu’une question de fait, et non pas une question de foi. Mais l’aborder, serait, il me semble, faire un grand pas, car ce serait *commencer à négocier*, et en cela, comme en bien d’autres choses, il n’y a que le premier pas qui coûte.

Il existe, bien sûr, au moins une vingtaine d’évêques en Angleterre ou dans les colonies, qui partagent vos idées. Eh bien ! si ces vingt évêques se présentaient à Rome, en disant : ‘ Voilà nos titres d’Ordination, examinez-les, examinez nos preuves,’ je suis convaincu que l’effet produit serait immense. En tout cas vous auriez attesté votre croyance à la primauté d’honneur, qui ne consiste pas, j’imagine, en une question de préséance et de politesse, et il serait acquis à nos yeux que vos ordres sont valides. Mais, en attendant, et ici je retombe sur mes pattes, pourquoi ne pas agiter la question dans la presse, surtout en France. J’ai ouï dire par des mauvaises langues, que nous

étions, nous français, les commis-voyageurs des idées des autres. Une chose certaine, c'est que nous sommes vulgarisateurs et apôtres par nature. Quand nous avons une idée, bonne ou mauvaise peu importe, il faut qu'elle fasse le tour du monde, si non, nous ne sommes pas contents. Vous devriez profiter de ce génie particulier de notre race, et faire connaître en France l'état de votre Eglise. Si les Français y prennent goût, soyez tranquille, il faudra que tout le monde en tâte.

Dans votre lettre du 12 décembre vous me disiez une chose fort grave : 'Je veux me confesser . . . je suis tout contrit.' . . . Savez-vous que je suis capable de prendre au sérieux mon rôle de père spirituel ? Vous vous confessez, oui vraiment ? mais quand on se confesse, on ne raisonne pas, mon cher enfant ! Et vous vous permettez de raisonner : 'je ne vous envoie pas le discours de X parce que' . . . 'je ne vous parle pas de la réunion d'York parce que' . . . etc. Tous ces 'parce que' sont de trop. Il fallait dire : Je vous avais promis ceci et cela, pardonnez-moi, mon père, je ne recommencerai plus, et je tâcherai de réparer ma faute en vous envoyant, si possible, ce que je vous avais promis. Voilà qui est parler en vrai pénitent. Pour cette fois je ne continue pas ma fonction jusqu'au bout, et je ne vous impose pas de pénitence, mais la prochaine fois, gare !

Ce que j'exige, par exemple, c'est que vous m'envoyiez mon travail pour la *Revue*, sans quoi je suis déshonoré, et pour un professeur de théologie morale, c'est chose grave. Envoyez-moi aussi certaines communications pour les journaux. Il faut décidément secouer votre '*tiédeur épouvantable dans laquelle vos devoirs même les plus nécessaires vous semblent presque impossibles.*' Et pour achever de vous réchauffer, venez donc bientôt passer quelques jours auprès de nous. Comme nous serons heureux de vous recevoir et quel bonheur pour moi de vous posséder là tout près, de causer et de vous confesser.

Il faut pourtant bien m'arrêter. Avouez, mon cher ami, que je suis en veine de bavardage. Causer avec vous est plus agréable que de creuser le traité de la Justice. Ce matin j'ai expliqué les différentes circonstances de lieux, de temps, de mode dans lesquelles la restitution doit se faire ; matière peu intéressante, mais malheureusement très pratique.

Tout à l'heure au réfectoire, on nous a lu un passage de St. Cyprien bien remarquable. Ce grand homme écrivait à Rome pour demander au pape d'user de tous les pouvoirs qui lui sont

confiés, de déposer Marcien, évêque d'Arles et primat des Gaules, et de lui donner un remplaçant. Cela suppose une croyance qui dépasse toute primauté d'honneur, il me semble. Naturellement j'ai pensé à vous, comme je le fais bien souvent, en particulier lorsque je trouve des citations, ou des exposés de doctrine qui me frappent beaucoup plus maintenant qu'autrefois.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
29 janvier 1892.

La mort du duc de Clarence a tout bouleversé ici, jamais on n'a vu un tel deuil. Je reviens de Windsor où j'ai été pour l'enterrement, et je ne saurais vous dire à quel point la cérémonie a été navrante. J'ai vu le Prince de Galles le jour après, cela m'a déchiré le cœur. Ah ! que ce monde est triste !

Lady Halifax, Marie¹ et mon frère² jouent aux cartes. Et moi, je vais répondre à votre lettre.

Je ne connais pas le livre dont vous me parlez. Quoique je l'aie perdu de vue depuis longtemps, ce M. Cobb m'était connu autrefois, avant, et à l'époque du concile du Vatican. Il s'est fait remarquer par un livre sur la Présence réelle, intitulé, *The Kiss of Peace*, dans lequel il démontrait que ce que l'Eglise anglicane nie dans le mot 'transsubstantiation' n'est pas ce que l'Eglise romaine entend par ce mot, mais, la *transaccidentation*, et que sur ce point il n'y a pas vraiment de différence entre les Eglises, que c'est une question de mots, une logomachie, et pas autre chose.

M. Cobb avait fondé toutes ses espérances sur le concile du Vatican. Il croyait que ce concile allait sûrement tout réconcilier, et que jamais il n'érigerait l'infailibilité du Pape en article de foi ; quand le dogme a été proclamé Cobb a perdu la foi, il a cessé de communier, et il est resté depuis longtemps isolé, avec toutes les bases de sa croyance brisées. On prie beaucoup pour lui, et je crois que maintenant il revient à la foi.

Pour ce que vous dites au sujet d'une demande auprès de Rome de la part d'évêques anglais, pour une enquête sur la validité de nos ordres, il serait sans doute facile qu'une telle demande fût faite si les évêques qui la feraient étaient prêts à accepter la décision du Pape, quelle qu'elle fût. Mais croyez-vous qu'une

¹ My daughter (married to Colonel Sutton, Coldstream Guards).

² Colonel, the Hon. Henry Wood.

telle demande pourrait s'arranger si ceux qui la fesaient, demandaient cette enquête de la part du Pape, non comme si les ordres étaient douteux, mais comme préliminaire pour des discussions visant à la réunion des Eglises. Pour moi, je crains beaucoup que l'état des esprits de chaque côté ne soit pas assez avancé pour permettre de croire qu'une telle demande pourrait être faite avec succès à l'heure qu'il est. Il y aurait plus à espérer d'une demande de la part de l'archevêque de Canterbury au Pape de permettre à des envoyés d'Angleterre de fouiller la bibliothèque du Vatican, et toutes les archives de la cour de Rome. Je parlais d'une telle demande l'autre jour à l'évêque de Rochester,¹ et si on croyait ici qu'elle ne serait pas refusée, il me semble que cela pourrait très bien se faire. Des relations personnelles établies entre l'Archevêque de Canterbury et le St. Siège, si les questions d'étiquette et de titres pouvaient être arrangées, seraient d'une très grande importance.

J'ai envoyé un exemplaire du petit livre de l'Abbé Perraud que vous m'avez donné à la Princesse de Galles ; il lui a plu beaucoup.

Ah ! mon cher ami, ce n'est pas à moi de le dire, qui ne veux pas me donner la peine du petit travail que vous m'avez demandé, mais si seulement la paix pouvait se faire entre nous !

J'espère bien vous voir au mois de mars, ou peut-être au commencement d'avril.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

3 février 1892.

Je vous expédie un journal, dans lequel vous trouverez un article sur . . . je n'ose pas le dire ; il le faut bien pourtant quand ce ne serait que pour vous donner sa raison d'être. Le petit article est sur Gladstone :² il a été motivé par un article paru dans un journal républicain et anti-religieux, ce qui d'ordinaire chez nous va ensemble. Dans cet article fort élogieux d'ailleurs pour votre compatriote, on parlait surtout de Gladstone homme politique, et de ses opinions sur l'Italie. Dans un petit paragraphe, on faisait allusion à ses opinions philosophiques : j'ai voulu leur faire savoir que Gladstone avait autre

¹ Very Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, afterwards Bishop of Winchester and now Archbishop of Canterbury.

² Article intitulé *Gladstone et Léon XIII.*, which appeared in the *Express du Midi*.

chose que des opinions philosophiques, et leur faire constater que l'on pouvait être grand homme d'Etat et bon chrétien. Vous me direz combien il y a de bêtises dans mon factum.

Et maintenant causons. Le but à atteindre pour le moment, ce me semble, serait d'obtenir que la question des Ordres qui sera, nécessairement et toujours, la première question, fût posée.

L'auteur de l'histoire du concile du Vatican, l'Archevêque de Florence, Mgr. Cecconi, après avoir rapporté des extraits de l'opuscule de Cobb, dit : 'Tous les catholiques, et, je ne crains pas de l'affirmer, le Saint Siège lui-même, seraient heureux de voir entamer une *sérieuse et loyale* discussion sur une matière où M. Cobb montre tant d'assurance : ce serait là un avantage précieux pour la science historique, et, ce qui vaut mieux, pour le salut des âmes, car on mettrait fin à une controverse historico-dogmatique ouverte il y a trois siècles : alors tout anglican de bonne foi, tout ministre de ce culte ne tarderait pas à prendre une détermination, non pas conforme à l'opinion de ceux qui pensent comme M. Cobb, mais de tout point d'accord avec la vérité. Que les anglicans produisent donc 'les preuves authentiques (documentary evidence) plus que suffisantes pour faire casser le verdict traditionnel rendu contre la validité de leurs Ordinations.'

J'ai tenu à vous rapporter ce passage tout entier ; les mots 'sérieuse et loyale' sont soulignés par l'auteur lui-même. Vous voyez donc, mon cher ami, que la chose paraît possible à d'autres qu'à moi. Je crois que pour examiner la question, à Rome, on n'exigerait pas une adhésion préalable à toute la doctrine romaine, et que le fait serait discuté en dehors de toute doctrine. Ce n'est pas à dire qu'il soit bon d'aborder la question *ex abrupto*, il faudrait y amener peu à peu les esprits, de manière à ce que tout le monde presque le demandât. Pour cela, comme entrée en matière, des recherches à faire dans la bibliothèque du Vatican seraient un excellent terrain. Mais, là encore, si, comme je le crois, la permission est accordée sans difficulté, dans la manière de procéder, il faut aller doucement. Il serait bon de sonder le terrain par des intermédiaires qui ne compromettraient personne. Et de plus, la permission obtenue, il vous faudrait à Rome un prêtre, connaissant un peu les Italiens et voulant fermement la réussite de l'entreprise. Ce prêtre éviterait à vos envoyés bien des ennuis, et leur rendrait d'inappréciables services. En tout cas, il faut éviter à tout prix que la tenta-

tive de rapprochement si elle est lancée, échoue, car ce serait, après, pire qu'avant.

Si vous le désirez, je pourrai écrire à Rome à un ancien nonce de Lisbonne, avec lequel j'ai fait autrefois un *peu de diplomatie* : c'est le cardinal Vincent Vannutelli, *persona grata* auprès de Léon XIII., homme très fin et destiné, je crois, à occuper bientôt un poste important. Ou mieux, je pourrais tout d'abord, obtenir les règlements de la bibliothèque vaticane, bien que les règlements généraux ne servent pas à grand' chose. Si vous croyez que ces règlements doivent vous être utiles je pourrai les obtenir facilement, je pense.

La conclusion qui s'impose, c'est qu'il y a quelque chose à faire. Vous n'imaginez pas comme je serais heureux de vous être utile, en tout cela.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

MAISON AFFRE, PLACE STE. EUGÉNIE,
BIARRITZ,¹ 27 février 1892.

Un mot pour vous annoncer notre arrivée. Lady Halifax va mieux, Dieu merci, et commence à entrer en pleine convalescence ; c'est un grand soulagement pour moi. Je crois que nous serons ici au moins jusqu'au commencement du mois d'avril ; mais cela dépend de la convenance du climat pour Lady Halifax. Toutefois je viens à Cahors² ou le mois prochain, ou au commencement d'avril, probablement le mois prochain, du moins si cela vous est égal.

Il me paraît que la situation en France entre l'Eglise et l'Etat se précise, et tout à l'avantage de l'Eglise. L'encyclique du Pape devrait faire beaucoup de bien partout : on ne saurait voir la question plus nettement posée.

Je finis à l'instant les 'Origines du culte chrétien' par l'Abbé Duchesne. Cela me paraît une œuvre de premier ordre ; les aperçus qui s'y trouvent sur quelques auteurs anglais ne laissent rien à désirer. Je suis de plus en plus convaincu que tout ce qu'il faut pour la paix entre nous, c'est de la bonne volonté, et une connaissance un peu exacte des choses, mais, c'est précisément ce qu'il y a de plus rare sur cette terre.

¹ Lady Halifax's health was still a cause for anxiety, and in consequence she was ordered to go to Biarritz in February 1892.

² April 2nd, I went to stay with the Abbé at the Grand Séminaire at Cahors, and I remained there till the 8th, when I rejoined Lady Halifax in Paris.

I spent the opening days of April with the Abbé at Cahors, and after I left I wrote to him as follows :—

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HÔTEL VOLTAIRE, PARIS,
8 avril 1892.

J'ai été très triste en vous disant adieu hier, et pendant tout le voyage je ne faisais rien que regretter les bons jours passés avec vous au séminaire.

Je n'en dis rien, mais soyez certain que je vous suis très reconnaissant. Il me semble qu'il aurait été impossible d'avoir plus de bontés que celles que tout le monde a eues pour moi.

Samedi.

Dîner très agréable hier soir, chez Mlle. Gavard : ¹ le Duc de Broglie, M. Anatole Leroy Beaulieu, un secrétaire de l'ambassade d'Angleterre, et, enfin, le curé de la Madeleine. On m'a demandé beaucoup de choses au sujet de l'évêque de Lincoln, et je crois que le dîner n'a pas été tout à fait inutile. Je suis même entré en relations avec le curé de la Madeleine qui me permettra de lui écrire et de lui rendre visite quand je me trouverai à Paris. Lui aussi désire beaucoup qu'on écrive quelque chose en français au sujet de l'église anglicane.

Lisez dans le *Temps* le discours de Pierre Loti et la réponse de M. Mézières, de l'Académie.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HÔTEL BARDET, MONT-DORE,
PUY-DE-DÔME, 19 juillet 1892.

Vous êtes bien surpris, n'est-ce pas, en lisant l'adresse au haut de cette lettre ? Lady Halifax a été encore si souffrante que le médecin a voulu positivement qu'elle essayât des eaux qu'on trouve ici.

Je prends la plume pour vous dire que j'ai travaillé un peu aux choses dont nous parlions à Cahors, et que j'ai fait un commencement au sujet du livre sur les ordinations anglicanes, et pour ce qui touche à la demande de visiter les manuscrits au Vatican. Le nouvel archevêque de Westminster ² a été tout à fait aimable pour tout ce qui touche au Vatican.

¹ Sister of M. Charles Gavard, for some time Secretary of Legation at the French Embassy in London. They were both intimate friends of mine.

² Cardinal Vaughan.

The Cardinal was quite the reverse, however, in regard to the question of Orders. I see from my Diary that I had called upon him on 4th July, and had stayed to luncheon. My object had been to interest him in, and obtain his help on behalf of, a serious effort in the interests of reunion. I remember insisting how much might be done by a friendly and sympathetic attitude on the part of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to bring back the Church of England as a whole into communion with the Holy See, that nothing was so great a cause of irritation as the attitude adopted by those authorities in regard to the Orders and Sacraments conferred by the Church of England, and that, if an investigation into the facts, as I believed must be the case in any fair and impartial inquiry, led to a reconsideration of that attitude on the part of Rome, a step, the importance of which could not be exaggerated, would have been taken in the interests of peace.

To all this the Cardinal only replied that the question of Rome was the crucial question, that it was the question which would have to be settled in the end, and that it was therefore better to begin with it, the exactly opposite course which, for the reasons given, I had advocated.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

3 septembre 1892.

Avez-vous retrouvé votre calme et pouvez-vous travailler ? ¹ Il me tarde de savoir si vous allez aborder enfin votre travail sur les Ordres. Il y aurait bien je crois quelque chose à faire sur le procès de l'évêque de Lincoln. Voyons, un bon mouvement. Je ne vous rappelle pas vos anciennes promesses, mais souvenez-vous de ce que vous disiez au Mont-Dore. Ce serait vraiment le moment de faire quelque chose.

Que disent les médecins au sujet de Lady Halifax ? J'aime à espérer qu'ils ne jugeront pas un séjour en Egypte nécessaire et qu'ils se borneront à vous envoyer dans le Midi de France. Ce sera moins ennuyeux pour vous et beaucoup plus agréable pour moi.

¹ After our return from Mont-Dore, where the Abbé had passed some days with us in August.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

12 octobre 1892.

Votre silence¹ me surprenait beaucoup, j'étais inquiet d'être sans nouvelles, et ennuyé de ne rien recevoir au sujet de votre congrès de Folkestone.² L'*Univers* nous en a parlé, mais assez sommairement et assez mal, comme vous avez pu vous en convaincre par le numéro que je vous ai envoyé. Or, c'est tout ce que notre clergé français saura de vos réunions. Dans d'autres circonstances, je vous aurais demandé de m'envoyer de vos journaux, de m'écrire une longue lettre, et avec ces éléments j'aurais composé un article que j'aurais fait paraître probablement dans le *Monde* ; mais je n'ose pas vous imposer ce travail et ces ennuis au milieu de votre tristesse, et des dérangements qu'une telle mort vous occasionne. Vous me feriez grand plaisir, cependant, en m'envoyant des journaux et votre discours.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, DONCASTER, 29 décembre 1892.

Sachez le bien ; il n'y a personne à qui je pense plus souvent qu'à vous, ni aucun sujet qui me préoccupe plus que celui qui est le commencement, le milieu et la fin de toutes nos conversations, c'est-à-dire, la paix de l'Eglise, et ce qu'on pourrait faire pour mettre fin au schisme entre l'Angleterre et Rome.

Vous souvenez-vous d'un conseil que vous m'avez donné au Mont-Dore, de faire une petite retraite et de prendre une bonne résolution de donner suite à ce qui pourrait se faire pour la cause que nous avons à cœur. Eh bien, j'ai obéi, je suis allé chez ces prêtres à Oxford passer quelques jours (cela m'a bien rappelé Cahors) et Dieu aidant, je vais essayer de faire un peu plus que par le passé. C'est une résolution que les bons jours de Noël vont aider à fructifier. Pour le moment nous sommes au beau milieu de toutes les fêtes de Noël. Ce soir il y a un concert, Agnès et Edouard jouent chacun d'un instrument, et tous les domestiques sont en réquisition—on m'assure que cela va être très beau. Lady Halifax est chef d'orchestre, et se démène avec son bâton d'une façon tout à fait professionnelle. Demain il y a un bal pour tout le monde, maîtres, domestiques, fermiers, etc., etc., et la grande question est avec quel cavalier Lady

¹ Owing to the death of my brother-in-law, the Hon. John Dundas, who had died very suddenly at Hickleton in September of this year.

² The Church Congress at Folkestone.

Halifax doit danser la première contredanse. La semaine prochaine tous les enfants du voisinage doivent venir jouer ici ; il y aura un prestidigitateur pour les amuser et tout doit finir par un petit bal dont Agnès et Edouard vont faire les honneurs. Mercredi nous recommençons notre train accoutumé, et vers le quinze janvier Lady Halifax et Agnès partent pour Biarritz. Malheureusement, il m'est impossible de les accompagner, et je garde Marie pour me tenir compagnie dans ma solitude. C'est probable que je viendrai passer un mois à Biarritz à la fin de février. Lady Halifax est un peu enrhumée ces derniers temps, et je serais content de la voir à l'abri de nos brouillards. Edouard est à la maison depuis dix jours ; on lui donne les meilleurs certificats de son école. Marie se porte à merveille, et Lady Beauchamp et ses enfants sont aussi on ne peut mieux. Robert et la petite Agnès Lygon viennent à Lincoln le douze du mois prochain pour leur confirmation. La cérémonie a lieu dans la chapelle de l'évêque. Un peu plus tard Lady Beauchamp et les siens doivent rejoindre Lady Halifax à Biarritz. Voici bien toutes les nouvelles que j'ai à vous donner sur vos amis d'ici.

En fait de politique, personne ne croit que le gouvernement puisse durer. Dans la politique c'est bien l'imprévu qui arrive, et il se pourrait bien que M. Gladstone ait des surprises dans sa poche qui étonneront le monde. Mais pour le coup je crois que l'impression générale est bien fondée, et je tiens pour certain, que le gouvernement ne durera pas longtemps. Monsieur Gladstone vieillit beaucoup et son parti est traversé par tant d'intérêts divers que la moindre petite chose pourrait remettre Lord Salisbury au pouvoir. Le Parlement se rassemble le 30 ou 31 janvier et ça va être pour nous autres un temps d'intérêt exceptionnel. Je crois pour ce qui touche les missionnaires¹ en Afrique qu'au fond la question est politique et non religieuse. On est d'accord ici pour vouloir l'impartialité la plus complète de la part du gouvernement entre les missionnaires catholiques et protestants, et on croit que le capitaine Lugard² a voulu tout simplement imposer la paix à tous les partis. Tout de même, à mon avis des choses déplorables ont été faites et surtout dites, et je vous avoue que mes sympathies sont très divisées. Je suis en correspondance avec l'évêque de Salisbury et d'autres au sujet de la brochure sur les ordinations anglicanes,³ et j'espère vous donner bientôt des informations précises à propos de cet

¹ Missionaries in Uganda.

² Sir Frederick D. Lugard, K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O.

³ The Abbé had been trying to write something on the subject.

ouvrage. J'ai envoyé à l'évêque les notes que vous aviez écrites là-dessus. Je crois que l'évêque écrira lui-même quelque chose qui traitera la question de la 'matière et de la forme du sacrement.' Pour le moment il m'envoie une lettre qu'il a adressée à l'Archevêque d'Utrecht. Cette lettre traite seulement la question historique. Evidemment, ce n'est pas à l'Eglise Janséniste qu'il faut s'adresser, mais je vous envoie la lettre telle qu'elle est. Comme vous le verrez, la lettre est en latin, avec une traduction en anglais.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

25 janvier 1893.

Vous avez vu par nos journaux que le prince d'Arenberg a posé une question¹ à notre Ministre des Affaires étrangères, on en fera autant chez vous. Je ne sais trop, au fond, que penser de l'affaire, mais vous pourriez, ce me semble, profiter de la circonstance pour stigmatiser les agissements de certains missionnaires, ministres protestants anglais, qui, pour nous, les représentent tous. C'est sans doute délicat, car il ne faut pas froisser l'amour propre national, cependant la chose me paraît faisable. Vous pourriez parler du Zanzibar² et de la conduite de vos amis. Il y aurait là, je crois, une bonne occasion de marquer votre désir de concorde et d'union. Vous le savez, à Madagascar, nos missionnaires ont trouvé des Anglais au travers de leur route. Dans l'Uganda, ce serait pareil, d'après nos renseignements. Bien souvent, nos relations des missions disent la même chose pour la Perse et pour bien d'autres endroits. Il serait bon qu'un désaveu autorisé partît de votre tribune parlementaire. Je serais tout heureux si, vous d'abord, et votre Ministre ensuite, faisiez connaître à notre monde catholique, que ces missionnaires n'ont rien de commun avec votre monde religieux. Dans le cas, mon cher ami, où vous croiriez devoir suivre mon modeste conseil, je vous prierais de m'envoyer le compte rendu de la séance ou des séances. Je m'en servirais et ferais quelque chose pour un journal de Paris.

L'évêque de Salisbury trouvera bien peu de chose dans mes notes. Je m'étais proposé de réunir dans ce cahier les textes et les documents qui pouvaient servir pour le travail dont nous

¹ In reference to the missionary troubles in Uganda.

² Where the members of the Universities Mission, including the Sisters of Charity from St. Raphael, Bristol, were on the best of terms with the Roman Catholic missionaries.

avons parlé si souvent, mais je n'en étais qu'au début de mes recherches : je souhaite que l'évêque de Salisbury et vos amis fassent bientôt paraître une solide démonstration de la validité de vos Ordres. Si, une fois le travail fini, examiné par vos principaux évêques, et approuvé par eux, on avait le courage d'en envoyer un exemplaire à Léon XIII., ce serait un grand pas.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

5 juin 1893.

Vos journaux vous ont-ils parlé d'un pèlerinage en terre sainte, à la tête duquel se trouvait Mgr. Langénieux, archevêque de Reims, nommé, pour la circonstance, légat du Saint Siège. Ce pèlerinage a pris les proportions d'une importante manifestation de sympathie pour l'Eglise orientale. Le discours de Mgr. Langénieux a été très beau et a produit, paraît-il, excellent effet. Je vous l'envoie. Vous trouverez dans le même journal un petit article sur l'Angleterre, qui a bien intéressé nos confrères, ce qui prouve, entre parenthèses, à quel point la question anglicane est nouvelle pour nous.

Je crois, mon cher ami, que le moment d'agir est venu. De toute part cette idée d'unité s'empare des esprits, c'est le vent qui souffle, ou plutôt, qui commence à s'élever doucement. Il faut en profiter pour rappeler qu'il n'y a pas seulement qu'une Eglise orientale à conquérir, mais que tout près, l'île des Saints fait les plus nobles efforts pour se débarrasser de mille liens, politiques et autres.

Le travail sur les Ordres avance-t-il ? Je voudrais bien avoir les détails. Pour nous, nous allons être absorbés par la lutte électorale ; je dis nous, mais c'est uniquement manière de parler, car tout en la suivant avec grand intérêt, elle ne me troublera guère.

CHAPTER III

CORRESPONDENCE—JULY 1892 TO JULY 1894—THE ABBÉ PORTAL'S PAMPHLET, *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*—ITS DIVISION INTO THREE PARTS: (1) 'LE RITE,' (2) 'LE MINISTRE,' (3) 'LE SUJET.'

IN July and August 1893 Lady Halifax was again ordered to Mont-Dore, where the Abbé Portal spent a week with us.

The preceding correspondence will show that at Roscoff and elsewhere the intention had been to get articles and other communications into French papers and reviews, in order to excite interest in the question of reunion. The Abbé had wished that I should myself write something on the question of Orders. But there had been much delay on my part, and when the Abbé came to Mont Dore he brought a sketch of a work on the Orders question which he had drafted himself in order to ascertain whether in my opinion the draft suggested would serve as the basis for such a discussion as we had contemplated from the beginning. We did a good deal of work together, and after I got home, the Abbé wishing for further information about the Church of England, in reference to a pamphlet he was preparing on the subject of English Orders, I suggested that Father Puller (one of the Cowley Fathers, and a very old friend of mine), who was a good French scholar and a perfect mine of accurate information, historical and theological, should pay him a visit in France.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

1 octobre 1893.

Le père Puller est en train de vous écrire une longue lettre, et Lady Beauchamp qui est ici et Lady Halifax travaillent à la traduire; ainsi vous voyez que nous nous hâtons d'exécuter vos volontés.

Priez bien pour moi pendant votre retraite.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, YORK, 9 novembre 1893.

Comment avez-vous trouvé la lettre du père Puller ? et la traduction, était-elle bonne ? Vous ne savez pas comme ces dames ont travaillé. Elles disaient tous les jours : l'abbé va-t-il être content de nous !

Il n'y a rien de nouveau chez nous. Mon discours a assez bien réussi à Birmingham,¹ et l'archevêque d'York avec qui j'ai été tout dernièrement, m'a donné une permission qui m'a fait grand plaisir.² Je vous conterai tout cela un autre jour.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE, 2 décembre 1893.

Je ne saurais vous dire avec quel plaisir j'ai lu votre lettre. Naturellement pas plus que le père Puller, je ne puis vous souhaiter le succès pour votre troisième partie, mais je crois que les trois parties mises ensemble, l'effet de votre brochure³ doit être ce que nous désirons. J'attends avec impatience la brochure elle-même. Combien d'exemplaires pouvez-vous nous donner ? C'est une campagne commencée, et une guerre qu'il faut mener à une bonne conclusion. Le cardinal ici et notre archevêque ne se raccommode pas, ce qui est grand dommage.⁴ Mais il faut finir, je brûle d'envie de lire votre écrit. Je suis bien content que vous appréciiez le père Puller comme il le mérite. C'est une personne que j'aime beaucoup.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

14 décembre 1893.

Notre revue, la *Science Catholique*, aura quelques retards. Au lieu de paraître le 15, elle paraîtra du 20 ou 25. Pour la brochure sur les Ordinations anglicanes, je me décide à en faire tirer 500 exemplaires.

¹ The Church Congress at Birmingham.

² Archbishop MacLagan, who gave us leave to use the first Liturgy of Edward VI. in our chapels at Hickleton and Garrowby.

³ The Abbé Portal's pamphlet on English Orders.

⁴ Speech of Archbishop Benson at the Annual Meeting of the National Society in June 1893. Sermon preached by Cardinal Vaughan at Cardiff on or about the 29th August, in which he had already made remarks adverse to the validity of Anglican Orders, to which the Archbishop had replied in his Visitation Charge at Ashford, reported in the *Guardian*, 8th November 1893.

Depuis quelques jours nous parlons plus particulièrement de vous et de toutes les choses qui nous intéressent avec notre Supérieur. Je lui ai fait passer tout mon travail,¹ quand j'ai eu le numéro de la *Science Catholique*, il en a été très content. Il le juge susceptible d'attirer l'attention et capable de changer beaucoup d'idées reçues parmi nous. Il croit, lui aussi, que la thèse soutenue n'est pas seulement vraie pour moi, mais qu'elle constitue la thèse opportune. A la grâce de Dieu : nous avons travaillé pour sa gloire, c'est à lui de donner à l'œuvre la fortune convenable.

The Abbé's Pamphlet was published in France towards the end of January : it was reviewed in the London *Guardian* on the 21st of February. It was divided into three parts : the first dealt with the question of the Rite ; the second with the fact of the Succession ; and the third with the validity of the Orders themselves. The Rite was held to be sufficient, the historical fact of the Succession was admitted, with a doubt as to the intention ; the validity was denied in consequence of the suppression of the porrection of the Instruments, on the ground that the Church has the power to vary the form and matter of some of the Sacraments, *i.e.*, where the form and matter have not been directly instituted by Christ.

The last point, which was the unfavourable one, is not the ordinary teaching actually given by Roman theologians, and as such was certain to be called in question. As a matter of fact, the Abbé Duchesne, in the *Bulletin Critique* of the 15th of July 1894, concluded that on proof of the sufficiency of the Rite, and the fact of the historical Succession, the validity of the Orders must necessarily be allowed.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, 8 janvier 1894.

Je trouve votre article² excellent ; ce que vous m'envoyez aussi 'du ministre' ne laisse rien à désirer. Permettez-moi, mon cher ami, de vous dire que la manière dont vous avez saisi

¹ Pamphlet on English Orders.

² In *La Science Catholique*, on the Orders conferred by the Church of England.

les points essentiels, et dont vous vous êtes rendu maître des faits, est vraiment surprenante. C'est une vraie grâce, que Dieu vous ait donné l'idée d'entreprendre cette œuvre. Il faut qu'il en sorte des résultats dont nous ne saurions à ce moment estimer l'importance. Pour moi, je suis de plus en plus convaincu que la méthode que nous avons adoptée est la seule bonne. Il faut désirer l'unité et être convaincu que Dieu la veut plus que toute autre chose. Il faut, de chaque côté, être bien résolu à envisager les choses du point de vue de l'autre parti ; il faut donner toute sa valeur à ce que chacun peut avancer, et être bien résolu à pécher (si on pêche) du côté de la charité et de la paix, et non du côté d'une sévérité qui empêche de bien apprécier toutes les considérations permettant un jugement favorable. Il faut insister sur tout ce qui est vraiment nécessaire et permettre une grande latitude sur tout ce qui peut être considéré comme matière d'opinion. Il faut aussi pour être juste s'abstenir rigoureusement de tout reproche qui, *mutatis mutandis*, pourrait être aussi bien dirigé contre soi-même. Par exemple, nous autres nous devrions laisser de côté ce que nous trouvons à redire chez vous, et nous appliquer à corriger nos propres fautes. Et de votre côté il faut, pour le moment, laisser les points les plus difficiles, et essayer de trouver un accord là où l'ignorance et les préjugés ont créé des différences, là où en vérité, et avec des explications, il n'y en a pas. Je suis en train d'écrire quelque chose dans ce sens. Après tout, il n'y a, et il ne peut y avoir, qu'une Eglise,—je ne crois pas à la théorie des trois branches de l'Eglise,—et si de notre côté nous sommes convaincus que, bien que séparés extérieurement, nous ne sommes en vérité qu'un corps avec vous, tout ce qui vous touche nous touche aussi. Vu le passé, nous pouvons bien pour le moment supporter avec patience la négation de notre position, de la part des autorités de l'Eglise romaine, du cardinal Vaughan, par exemple.

Le père Puller attend la seconde partie de votre travail dans la *Science Catholique* pour venir ici afin de mettre en train chez nous des comptes rendus de votre œuvre. Il est en retraite en ce moment, mais il m'écrit qu'il sera libre dans à peu près quinze jours.

Il fait un temps détestable ici ; beaucoup de neige et un froid insupportable. Quant à la politique, on croit que la chambre des Communes sera dissoute assez prochainement, dans le

courant de cette année certainement, et que les élections qui auront lieu seront peu favorables à M. Gladstone et à son gouvernement. La vérité est que l'Angleterre a bien mal traité l'Irlande dans le passé, mais que le 'Home Rule Bill' n'est autre chose, dans les circonstances actuelles, qu'un procédé pour mettre le gouvernement de l'Irlande entre les mains du parti révolutionnaire.

Je suis content que M. le Supérieur soit satisfait de votre travail ! Voulez-vous bien me rappeler à son bon souvenir, et à celui de M. le Professeur de Théologie et de M. l'Econome.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

29 janvier 1894.

Je suis désolé que vous n'avez pas reçu la Revue ; le père Puller m'écrit à la date du 24 qu'il l'a reçue.

Il me vient déjà quelques impressions touchant mes articles, la dominante est l'étonnement sur l'ensemble, et, comme je l'avais prévu, une grande répugnance à admettre ma troisième partie. Un de mes amis¹ m'écrivait hier : 'Tu auras pour sûr beaucoup de peine à faire admettre la nullité des Ordinations anglicanes pour ce motif de la suppression de la porrection des instruments, comme aussi, que l'Eglise puisse dans le cours des temps changer, ou quasi changer, la matière de certains sacrements.'

Je vais vous envoyer un autre exemplaire de la *Science Catholique*, et si par hasard vous en aviez deux, ayez la bonté de me le renvoyer.

Et puis, vous aurez la bonté de m'envoyer, ou de me signaler, les articles de journaux ou de revues qui parleront de notre œuvre commune. Je le crois, moi aussi, le moment est bien opportun. Que le bon Dieu serait bon, s'il voulait se servir de nous pour faire quelque bien dans son Eglise. Je ne puis y penser sans émotion.

Ci-joint copie d'un entrefilet de *l'Univers*, qui pourrait vous intéresser. Il serait bon de le faire publier par vos journaux et montrer par là à tous les vôtres, que Léon XIII. s'occupe de l'union des Eglises.

¹ M. Verdier, supérieur du grand séminaire de Montpellier.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

79 EATON SQUARE, S.W.,
23 février 1894.

J'ai parlé de votre travail aux archevêques de Canterbury et d'York, et aussi à l'évêque de Rochester,¹ et ils m'ont prié de leur envoyer un exemplaire de la brochure. Ils s'y sont beaucoup intéressés. Mais j'ai une foule de choses à vous dire à cet égard. Nous sommes au milieu d'une crise parlementaire qui me retient à Londres jusqu'au milieu de la semaine prochaine.

Le *Guardian*² publie un long article sur votre travail.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, DONCASTER, 4 avril 1894.

J'ai à vous remercier pour trois lettres. Je ferai de mon mieux pour qu'une lettre comme vous la désirez soit écrite au Cardinal Bourret.³

Vous avez bien deviné que la sienne ne m'a pas plu du tout. Vous savez aussi que si j'avais le moindre doute sur la validité de nos ordres je ne serais pas où je suis. Mais si une certitude peut devenir plus sûre, je deviens de jour en jour de plus en plus convaincu que quelles que soient les difficultés de la position de l'Eglise anglicane, (et ces difficultés je ne les atténue pas), ce que nous avons à faire, c'est de travailler où nous sommes, et dans la position que Dieu nous a donnée pour la diffusion de la vérité catholique, et pour la réunion des Eglises.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, 10 avril 1894. Jeudi saint.

Votre lettre⁴ est bien des plus intéressantes. Je reconnais avec vous que l'article du *Guardian* ne reproduit pas correctement ce que vous aviez dit au sujet du Pape Eugène IV. et du décret aux Arméniens. Vous n'avez jamais dit que ce

¹ Rt. Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, now Archbishop of Canterbury.

² *Guardian*, 21st February 1894, *La Science Catholique* 'on the Orders, and on the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England.'

³ Cardinal Bourret, the Bishop of Rodez, had addressed a letter to the Abbé Portal on the subject of his pamphlet, to which the Abbé had suggested, in a letter which is missing, that an answer should be made in England.

⁴ Letter missing.

fut Eugène iv. qui changea la matière du Sacrement pour l'Occident, mais, ce qui est tout autre chose, que son exposé de la doctrine des Sacrements constate la croyance de l'Eglise latine à cette époque. Maintenant, si nous passons de ce que dit l'article, à la chose en elle-même, il me semble qu'il y a une grande difficulté à concilier ce qu'écrivit Eugène iv. avec ce que dit Benoit xiv. Ce Pape (*De Syn. Diocesan.*, lib. viii. c. 10) si je le comprends bien, dit ce qui suit : ' Certains Docteurs disent que quoiqu'il soit vrai que les Latins à une certaine époque aient conféré les ordres par l'imposition des mains, comme le font actuellement les Grecs, cela n'empêche pas que la porrection des instruments soit nécessaire aujourd'hui dans l'Eglise latine, parce que notre Seigneur n'institua ni ne détermina la matière et la forme du Sacrement de l'ordre dans ses détails, mais donna la permission à son Eglise de les déterminer à sa volonté, et, pour juste cause, de les changer, pourvu qu'elle se servît toujours de choses et de mots propres à signifier l'effet des ordres sacrés. Ainsi ils enseignent que l'Eglise, ayant, dans le temps, désigné l'imposition des mains *seule*, avec les mots qui l'accompagnent, comme la forme et la matière, néanmoins plus tard, sous un changement de circonstances, elle laissa cette façon d'agir aux Grecs, tout en imposant une matière différente pour les Latins. Mais cette doctrine trébuche sur deux difficultés graves. Il n'est pas suffisamment constaté que Notre Seigneur ait donné un tel pouvoir à son Eglise ; même on pourrait dire que l'opinion contraire peut être démontrée d'après le Concile de Trente (Sess. xxi. cap. 2), qui a déclaré que l'Eglise a le pouvoir donné par le Christ de changer les choses qui touchent à la dispensation des Sacrements pourvu que *leur substance* soit gardée intacte. Or le changement de la matière et de la forme appartient *non* au rite et à la dispensation d'un Sacrement mais à sa substance. Et puis, même si ce pouvoir a été donné à l'Eglise, c'est une supposition tout à fait arbitraire et gratuite que l'Eglise s'en soit jamais servie, à moins qu'on dise, où et quand, dans quel Concile ou par quel Pape un tel changement a été fait. A vrai dire, si l'Eglise avait ôté du rite de l'ordination ce qui avait été fait dans les temps anciens, nous serions obligés d'affirmer que la matière et la forme de l'ordination ont été changées par l'autorité de l'Eglise, et une nouvelle matière et forme substituées à l'ancienne. Mais, comme tout ce qui est contenu dans les anciens rites reste intact, et qu'ils sont accomplis dans leur intégrité et leur sainteté, personne ne croira facilement

que ces choses qui étaient autrefois suffisantes pour rendre parfait le Sacrement de l'ordre, ne suffisent pas maintenant.' ¹

J'ai bien mal traduit ce que dit Benoît xiv., cependant, vu qu'Eugène iv. ne dit pas un mot de l'imposition des mains, mais parle seulement de la porrection des instruments, il me semble que ce n'est pas très facile de le concilier avec Benoît xiv., et que ce dernier serait favorable à notre thèse que l'omission de la porrection des instruments (supposant toujours qu'il y ait eu l'intention de conférer le Sacrement de l'ordre, et que la succession de fait a été gardée), ne peut pas, par elle-même, invalider les ordres, qui, par ailleurs, seraient valides. Il y a encore une décision de la Congrégation du Saint Office, donnée le 9 avril, 1704, et confirmée en 1860, sur les ordinations d'Ethiopie qui dans ses principes est des plus favorables pour nous, mais je n'ai pas le temps de vous l'envoyer aujourd'hui : ce sera pour un autre jour.

Regardez aussi ce que dit le Cardinal Bellarmin (*Disputationes de controversiis* De Sacram. in gen., lib. i. cap. 27, tom. iii. p. 27, Col. 1628) sur l'intention. Il me semble encore ici, que ce que dit le cardinal a une grande valeur pour le point traité par vous au sujet de l'intention de Barlow. Mais, mon cher ami, comme vous dites, au delà de toute controverse, ce qu'il y a à faire c'est d'intéresser les personnes à ce sujet, de leur faire un peu comprendre que la question renferme de plus grandes difficultés que l'on ne s'est peut-être imaginé, et qu'enfin, ce que veut Notre Seigneur, et à quoi nous devons tous travailler, c'est la réunion des Eglises. Je crois qu'il y a beaucoup à pardonner de tous les côtés, et que le devoir est imposé à tous de chercher non ce qui peut convenir à un côté ou à l'autre, mais la vérité seule.

On m'a envoyé d'Arras un bon nombre d'exemplaires de votre brochure. J'en ai donné à nos deux archevêques. L'évêque de Rochester m'en a parlé avec beaucoup d'intérêt, et je le crois tout prêt à en parler dans son prochain mandement. Malheureusement il est tombé malade. Cette maladie l'a empêché d'accompagner la reine à Florence. Ce que vous me dites de votre évêque,² et du cardinal³ et ce que vous a écrit l'évêque de Madère, sont des faits très encourageants. Je suis sûr que, plus on considère la question, plus nous avons à y gagner.

¹ The opinion here attributed to Benedict XIV. was criticised in the Abbé Portal's reply to an article of Father Fuller's.

² Mgr. Grimardias, the Bishop of Cahors.

³ Cardinal Bourret, Bishop of Rodez.

Evidemment, chez vous on ne va pas admettre la validité de nos ordres tout d'un coup, mais si par votre travail (tout le monde ici le trouve très remarquable), et par vos bons offices vous parvenez à montrer au monde catholique en France, et à l'étranger, la question dans toute son étendue sans rien supprimer, plus aura été fait pour la paix de l'Eglise et pour la réunion de ceux qui aiment Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ en sincérité, que tout ce qui a été fait depuis des centaines d'années.

Voulez-vous me permettre de montrer votre lettre à l'archevêque de Canterbury, et à l'évêque de Rochester ?

Mr. W. J. Birkbeck to Lord Halifax

HOTEL STAVIANSKI BAZAAR,
Moscow, April 10/22, 1894.

You were kind enough to say that you would send me a copy of that French priest's ¹ Articles upon Anglican Orders. I wonder whether you could send me two or three copies out here ? A great controversy is going on between the leading theologians upon the Old Catholic question, and it is turning a great deal upon their inter-communion with Anglicans. I *personally* am against our having anything to do with the Old Catholics, whose position I always find it difficult to clear from the charge of schism ; but I think it would be a decidedly good thing, if theologians here could see that there are better grounds to attack them upon than the supposition that they are in communion with a church which has no Orders ! And two (General Kirieff, and Janisheff, the Emperor's confessor, whose very frank letter to the Archbishop, about the Jews you know about), who are taking part in the controversy are anxious, if possible, to defend Anglican Orders ; and I think independent testimony, such as are these articles by a French priest, would help the matter considerably.

I arrived here from St. Petersburg yesterday. The Lent services are wonderful. I never saw anything like the devotion of the people. In St. Petersburg on Wednesday and Friday, I was at the Mass of the Presanctified in the Kazan Cathedral, and each time the Church was crammed. To-day is Palm Sunday, and all yesterday in the streets every person almost that one met had his bundle of willow twigs, and at six o'clock (at Vespers followed by Matins) they took them to church to be blessed. I went from church to church, and all alike were

¹ The Abbé Portal.

crowded, the congregation in each case looking like the forest marching on Macbeth! The town is full of pilgrims from all parts of the country coming here for Holy Week, and the people who are going to make their Communion all go to Matins at one o'clock in the morning all through the week, sleeping the rest of the night on the steps of the numerous churches and shrines about the town. To-morrow begins the preparation of the Chrism which is consecrated on Maundy Thursday. They begin at eight o'clock to-morrow morning, and the mixing and boiling is spread over three days before the Mass of the Presanctified, which takes place at nine o'clock to-morrow, on Tuesday at ten, on Wednesday at eleven. It is finally consecrated on Thursday, after which, at twelve o'clock, follows the Liturgy of St. Basil, which they say lasts till about six in the evening on account of the numbers of communicants. I am staying here for a fortnight, and then am going to prowl about amongst monasteries and old towns all the way between here and the confines of Siberia, but how far I get rather depends on the state of the roads in the Urals.

I shall be back in the second week of June. Till then, this will be my headquarters. I hear that next month a description of the English Church Union is to appear in the leading Moscow monthly magazine, together with a full translation of my Gloucester paper. They are very much pleased with my last paper on the Russian Monasteries, and hardly a day passes without it being referred to in the newspapers; it is such a new experience for them to find their Church appreciated among Westerns! In the *Moscow Gazette* last week there was an article upon Gladstone's *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, in which they say that true Christianity is the same all over the world, and that 'just as "Birkbeck and Vannutelli" find themselves at home amongst Russian monks, so we Orthodox find something to learn even from a Western Liberal Prime Minister!'

The Abbé Duchesne to the Abbé Portal

PARIS, 13 avril 1894.

J'ai lu avec le plus grand intérêt votre travail sur les ordinations anglicanes. Mes études ne m'avaient pas jusqu'ici conduit de ce côté, et je vous remercie de m'avoir appris beaucoup de choses.

J'ai lu aussi la lettre de l'évêque de Rodez, qui me semble vous avoir peu compris, et qui ne vous recommande guère.

Avec vous, je crois que l'on ne peut contester le caractère épiscopal de Parker et de Barlow ; avec vous, j'admets que le rituel anglican est suffisant en soi. Mais je vais plus loin, et, de ces deux prémisses, je déduis la validité des ordinations anglicanes. Tout ce que l'on objecte du côté des intentions est sans valeur. Il y a eu de tout temps des prêtres et des évêques hérétiques, ou même incroyants, si l'on mesurait à leurs croyances secrètes ou avouées, la valeur de leurs actes ecclésiastiques, on n'aurait plus aucune sécurité.

D'autre part, je suis très disposé à admettre que l'Eglise peut modifier les formes et matières des sacrements—de certains cela s'entend. Mais cette latitude ne lui est attribuée que par des théologiens et par des théologiens embarrassés du conflit entre les divers usages. C'est un expédient dont ils se servent, ce n'est pas une décision de l'Eglise.

Maintenant, l'Eglise eût-elle par un acte explicite et solennel, décidé qu'elle se reconnaît un tel pouvoir, il faudrait encore, pour que votre thèse fût bien à l'abri, qu'elle eût déclaré, à un moment déterminé, qu'elle entendait en faire usage, et changer tel ou tel rite.

Dans la réalité on ne trouve rien de semblable. Ni Eugène iv., ni les scolastiques, dont il s'inspire, n'ont jamais imaginé que la porrection des instruments ne fût pas le rite original, institué par Notre Seigneur lui-même. Ils se sont trompés, cela est certain.

J'en étais là de ma lettre quand j'ai eu l'idée d'ouvrir un manuel de théologie, celui de Hurter, où je vois que Benoit xiv. désapprouve absolument l'opinion que vous exposez, et cela pour les mêmes raisons qui m'étaient venues à l'esprit.

Quant à l'autorité du décret aux Arméniens, je vois depuis longtemps que de bons théologiens ne le considèrent pas comme engageant l'infailibilité du pape. Ces théologiens doivent avoir raison. On peut en dire autant du décret de Nicolas en réponse aux questions des Bulgares. Là, il est enseigné que le baptême *in nomine Christi* est valide, ce qui n'est guère admis maintenant.

Maintenant, il est loin de ma pensée que l'Eglise romaine n'ait pas de bonnes raisons pour repousser les ordinations anglicanes. Sa pratique actuelle s'inspire de la théologie du seizième siècle, de principes erronés sans doute, faute de bons renseignements, mais qui jouissaient au temps du schisme d'une autorité in-

contestable. De plus, elle est, et elle a raison d'être, tuteur en matière de sacrements. Je ne crois pas que les Anglais eux-mêmes, s'ils se décidaient à l'union, se refusassent à une revalidation qui leur donnerait toute sécurité.

La question débattue est donc une question de théorie et d'érudition. Une solution pacifique de la part des théologiens catholiques, peut avoir un bon effet sur l'opinion anglaise, assurément la lettre du cardinal de Rodez, par son ton chagrin et son accent malveillant est de nature à produire l'effet contraire. Mais, contents ou mécontents, les Anglais n'en seront pas moins réordonnés. Pour les consoler, vous pourrez leur rappeler l'histoire de Bède, où l'on voit que le métropolitain Théodore réordonna de malheureux évêques parce que des prélats Bretons avaient figuré comme assistants à leur ordination.

The Rev. Edward Denny¹ to Lord Halifax

KEMPLEY VICARAGE, DYMOCK,
GLOUCESTER, May 3, 1894.

Many thanks for sending me M. Dalbus's² pamphlet. May I keep it for a little time as I should like to study it carefully ? I have got his last article in the December number of *La Science Catholique*, but have not been able to obtain the January number. It is very good of you to send me also the letter from the Abbé Duchesne : it is deeply interesting and most valuable ; I should like to copy it if I may—of course I shall make no use of it, nor, indeed, shall I mention it to any one. The opinion of one so learned ought to have great weight. Both it and M. Dalbus's pamphlet are to me most refreshing after a long course of reading the statements of other Roman writers on the subject ; the spirit in which they both write is so different, so much more in accordance, if I may say so, with that of our common Lord and Master. I should be interested to see any other work M. Dalbus may bring out on English Orders, especially if he either elaborates further his 'two points,' or (as I would fain hope) if he sees his way to take the Abbé Duchesne's line with regard to them, a line which I note is destructive of the two arguments on which he relies for his conclusion in his pamphlet.

If I may presume to differ from the Abbé Duchesne, I would like to add that Bede's statement, to which he refers in the

¹ One of the authors of the *De Hierarchia*.

² The Abbé Portal.

last paragraph of his letter, not only does not necessarily imply that Archbishop Theodore ordained St. Chad as one who had *never been validly consecrated*, but, on the contrary, to affix such a meaning to the words would appear to be inconsistent with the way in which Bede in his account of St. Chad's Episcopate at York, previous to the ceremony (whatever it was), evidently regards him as a true bishop; moreover, to take them as meaning that Archbishop Theodore as Metropolitan confirmed him in his office, thus doing away with any irregularity which from his point of view might have resulted from the fact that Weni, Bishop of Winchester, called in as co-operators in the consecration of St. Chad two British bishops, whom he would regard as schismatics, would be consistent with the Archbishop's practice as laid down in his *Penitential*, II. ix. 1, in which he ordained that 'those who have been ordained by bishops of Scots and Britons, or are not Catholic in the matter of Pasch and tonsure, have not been united to the Church *sed iterum a catholico episcopo manus impositione confirmentur*, besides which, since St. Chad was in a better position from the Archbishop's point of view than those mentioned here in the *Penitential*, inasmuch as his chief consecrator had been ordained in Gaul, and thus was not himself tainted with schism, it is, I think, impossible that Archbishop Theodore would do in St. Chad's case what he did not think necessary in the case of the British or Scottish ordination.

Mr. W. J. Birkbeck to Lord Halifax

HOTEL SLAVIANSKI BAZAR,
MOSCOW, April 25/May 7, 1894.

Many thanks for the copies of Dalbus on Anglican Ordinations: I shall send them to the two people I mentioned to you at St. Petersburg, who are interesting themselves in the matter. Duchesne's letter is most important, more especially as coming from one of the greatest living authorities upon the history of the Roman Pontifical.

I see that Dalbus adheres to the idea that the whole validity of a bishop's Orders stands or falls with that of his principal consecrator. This, of course, the Easterns utterly deny; on the contrary, some of them go so far as to say that if there are not at least two consecrators the consecration is not valid, inasmuch as it is not from a single bishop or patriarch, but from the bishops

as representatives of the whole Church that Orders are given. As far, therefore, as the Easterns are concerned, even if Barlow were proved not to have had valid orders, neither Parker nor his successors would of necessity be affected. But when I was in Belgium in February, staying at Maredsous, a French monk, Dom Germain Morin, who is one of my greatest friends there, told me that Cardinal Pitra, when working in Lambeth Library amongst documents, *had come upon the actual record of Barlow's consecration*. He told me that the fact was mentioned in Pitra's life, and that although the reference was not there given, because it was thought '*plus prudent*' to leave a matter which, after all, did not concern the Roman Church alone, he himself had seen it amongst Pitra's papers at Solesmes. I think the matter would be worth hunting out. Of course it may be one of Pitra's mare's nests (as the Bishop of Salisbury said to me the other day, he discovered more than one in his life) : still, it is worth thinking of, and if we could find the document, and produce it just at the moment when Dalbus and those who think with him are being hard pressed by their less charitable brethren, it would be most useful. If we can't find it at Lambeth, the next thing to do will be to try and get at the reference at Solesmes ; and as I know one or two of the monks there, and shall have anyhow to go there sometime soon with regard to a passage which Pitra found in the Vatican Library, describing the details of Vespers and Matins in the Greek Church in the fifth century, I think they might be inclined to show me the reference.

I am still here : it is very difficult to get away, I have so many bishops and abbots of various kinds to go and call on, as well as laymen. It is quite extraordinary the gratitude with which they have received those two papers of mine, read last winter. The one about the monasteries has been either described or quoted in full in quite half the papers, secular and ecclesiastical, in the empire, while the English Church Union one is to appear in May in the *Moscow Review*, with, I believe, an account of the English Church Union, which, if good, I shall certainly send you a translation of. I am going for a short expedition to the east of Russia, down to Kazan, and across the Urals, to see something of the Orthodox missions to the Tartars, and am already receiving invitations from some of the most active missionaries in those parts, so I expect to see a good deal in a much too short time. I hope it will all make for the peace of the Church. I am glad to see that the papers are beginning

again to speak of enlightened members of the English Church being more friendly disposed to Eastern Christianity than those of any other Western body, and to speak of us in general somewhat more as they did in 1888 after the Archbishop's letter to Kieff, and before he gave himself away to the Jews !

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

LONDRES, dimanche soir, 6 mai 1894.

Je viens de passer l'après-midi avec l'archevêque de Canterbury. Je lui ai lu plusieurs de vos lettres et celle du cardinal Bourret, et la lettre de l'archevêque d'Albi.¹ (Il avait déjà lu votre brochure et l'avait même annotée de sa main.) Il a été vivement intéressé. Comme vous le comprendrez facilement, la lettre du cardinal l'a un peu étonné (il faut admettre que le cardinal ne connaît pas son sujet). Je lui ai aussi montré la lettre de l'abbé Duchesne, dont il connaît bien les écrits. Ce que dit l'abbé Duchesne lui a paru de la première importance, et a produit le meilleur effet. A la fin de notre conversation il m'a demandé ce que je voulais, et il a écrit à l'évêque de Salisbury pour lui suggérer d'écrire une lettre telle que vous la désirez. L'évêque l'enverrait au *Guardian*, et vous vous en serviriez.

L'évêque de Salisbury doit être à Londres mardi. Je saurai mercredi ou jeudi s'il veut bien écrire la lettre que nous désirons. Sinon, un prêtre qui est tout à fait dans l'intimité de l'archevêque l'écrira, probablement avec quelque 'imprimatur' de l'archevêque.

J'ai aussi parlé de tout ceci samedi à l'évêque de Peterborough,² homme très capable et très instruit, et si nous échouons avec l'évêque de Salisbury, nous aurons recours à lui. Si l'évêque de Salisbury ne vient pas à Londres mardi, j'irai le trouver chez lui. Le résultat de tout ceci est que j'espère que nous allons faire quelque chose de notre côté. Maintenant que je suis arrivé à Londres, il me sera beaucoup plus facile d'agir, et je ferai de mon mieux.

Nous avons beaucoup de préjugés chez nous, et beaucoup d'ignorance, choses qu'on ne peut pas détruire tout d'un coup. Il me semble aussi qu'il y a une certaine dose d'ignorance parmi les vôtres.

¹ Mgr. Fonteneau.

² Rt. Rev. Mandell Creighton.

Nous pouvons dire comme Pierre l'Hermite et les Croisés à Vézelay, 'Dieu le veut.' La réunion de la Chrétienté doit être l'œuvre du siècle prochain, et je prie Dieu jour et nuit pour que nous puissions y contribuer.

Souvenez-vous de moi quelquefois quand vous dites la messe.

The Bishop of Salisbury¹ to Lord Halifax

SARUM, 7 May 1894.

The Archbishop has put into my hands the interesting letters of M. Fernand Dalbus, together with the documents which he has sent to you. He tells me that I may write to you on the subject for further elucidation, and asks if I feel inclined to take up the matter suggested. It is curious how this subject is being stirred just now in many quarters.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

21 mai 1894.

J'ai reçu ce matin la lettre² de l'évêque de Salisbury : elle est bonne. Sans doute, elle n'est pas parfaite, mais elle est bonne, très bonne même. Je l'expédie tout de suite au cardinal Bourret, à Rome, avec un mot. Son Ém. doit venir à Cahors fin juin, nous nous verrons alors et je tirerai de sa bonne volonté tout le parti possible.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Halifax

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
21st May 1894.

Thank you so much for the copy of the letter of the Abbé Duchesne. I know some of his greater work : he is *the* Frenchman whose criticism I should most stand in awe of.

I was so glad to hear that you went down to Sarum with the letter I sent you.³

Is not *that*⁴ all most touching ?

¹ Right Rev. John Wordsworth, died Aug. 1911.

² The Bishop of Salisbury had written the letter suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

³ I had been down to Salisbury to see the Bishop about his letter in reply to Cardinal Bourret.

⁴ Mrs. Wordsworth, the Bishop of Salisbury's wife, was dying.

The Archbishop of Dublin¹ did not write me the promised letter, and I wrote to ask him for it some days since. I have not heard yet.

*Lord Halifax to Dean Lake (he had resigned the Deanery of Durham)*²

May 30, 1894.

I had a long talk, and I think a satisfactory talk, with the Archbishop³ about a fortnight ago. He seemed to hope that the Archbishop of Dublin's deplorable and mischievous action in regard to consecrating a bishop for Spain might, after all, come to nothing. We shall do our best to help on so happy a solution of the difficulty, and have quite resolved, should matters go on, to present an address to the Spanish bishops, telling them what we think of the Archbishop of Dublin's action. Meanwhile, I have been busy on some very interesting work in connection with the validity of Anglican Orders. The question is being much discussed now in France. I much hope that great good will come of it.

The longer one lives the more convinced one becomes how great a duty it is to do all in one's power to heal the quarrel between Rome and ourselves. It is a quarrel which I am satisfied might be healed without any sacrifice of principle on either side, not now perhaps, but a little later, if only there is a little more goodwill on both sides. It is a pity Cardinal Vaughan is not a different man.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

3 juin 1894.

Je suis bien en retard avec vous, mais j'attendais pour vous écrire d'avoir en main la reproduction de la lettre de l'évêque de Salisbury. Le *Monde* l'a donnée dans son numéro du 28 mai : L'*Univers* la donnera prochainement : la *Vérité* qui a publié ces jours derniers la lettre du cardinal,⁴ la donnera aussi. Par ces trois journaux le clergé français, dans son ensemble, aura connaissance de la question. Chez toutes les personnes que je vois, l'impression est excellente. Je crois, mon cher ami, que voilà

¹ The Archbishop had remonstrated on the subject of the proposed consecration of a Spanish bishop for Spain.

² The Very Rev. William Charles Lake, D.D.

³ Archbishop Benson.

⁴ Cardinal Bourret.

un bon pas de fait. L'abbé Boudinhon a eu la délicatesse de m'envoyer les épreuves de son travail,¹ en me demandant si je n'aurais pas quelques observations à lui faire. L'ensemble dénote un théologien, et produira une certaine impression sur des hommes qui n'auraient pas étudié la question, mais la réplique ne sera pas trop difficile.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

Juin 1894.

Encore le *Moniteur de Rome* qui s'occupe de nous. Quand j'ai vu qu'il mettait un tel empressement à reproduire la lettre de l'évêque de Salisbury, je l'ai prié d'insérer toute ma conclusion. Pour le pousser, je lui ai dit que plusieurs personnalités de l'Eglise anglicane étaient d'accord avec moi, et voulaient essayer de créer un mouvement dans ce sens.

Ce matin, j'ai reçu la permission d'aller à Paris après le 15 juillet. Très probablement, j'y arriverai le 18.

Le Cardinal ² nous arrive samedi prochain.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

6 juillet 1894.

Les choses marchent bien ici. J'ai beaucoup parlé à nos deux archevêques. Je suis convaincu que c'est Dieu qui s'occupe de notre œuvre. J'ai des choses à vous dire qui vous feront plaisir.

Pourquoi ne venez-vous pas en Angleterre cette année ?

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

Juillet 1894.

Aller en Angleterre à cette époque est un peu tard, mais ce n'est pas impossible. Pour faire œuvre utile il me faudrait rester chez vous trois ou quatre semaines. Ce qui pour moi ne fait pas de doute, c'est la nécessité de nous rencontrer. Si je ne vais pas en Angleterre, il vous faudrait venir à Paris. Mais encore une fois j'ai bon espoir pour l'Angleterre.

¹ An examination of the Abbé Portal's pamphlet.

² Cardinal Bourret.

Je vous expédie un compte rendu bibliographique des pères jésuites.¹ Il est excellent ; l'auteur de l'article est un professeur de théologie, la position qu'il prend est très bonne, je l'apprécie d'autant plus que je redoutais un ton agressif. J'expédie un exemplaire à l'évêque de Salisbury, et un autre au père Puller.

Ma brochure a été traduite en Portugais, par un professeur de l'Université de Coïmbre.

¹ In the *Etudes Religieuses des Pères Jésuites*, No. du 30 juin 1894 (partie Bibliographique).

CHAPTER IV

THE ABBÉ PORTAL'S VISIT TO ENGLAND—HIS SUMMONS TO ROME

THE contents of the letter I have placed at the head of the succeeding chapter were, I believe, in whole or in part, together with other papers on the same subject, communicated to Cardinal Rampolla, by a friend of the Cardinal's, resident in Paris. It will be seen from the concluding paragraph that I was doubtful whether the time was ripe for the Abbé's visit to England, but circumstances over which we had no control decided the event, and the chapter which follows describes his visit, and concludes with my journey to Paris previous to the Abbé's departure for Italy on the 8th of September, in consequence of an intimation he had received that Cardinal Rampolla desired his presence in Rome.

The following letter was in reply to one from the Abbé, asking me to put down on paper what I had often said to him by word of mouth, in order that in speaking as he did to his friends, they might be assured he was, in fact, representing my opinions, and the opinions of others in England, and not merely his own.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

79 EATON SQUARE, 11 juillet 1894.

Ce qui est certain c'est que si Dieu nous prête vie, et s'il veut se servir de nous, nous allons travailler de toutes nos forces pour la réunion de l'Eglise anglicane avec le Saint Siège. Je suis sûr, pour beaucoup de raisons, que le temps est propice pour jeter des semences d'une telle œuvre, et que de contribuer pour la moindre des choses à la paix et à la réunion des Eglises, est ce

qu'il y a de plus beau dans ce monde. Rien que d'y songer remplit le cœur de joie, et, comme me disait l'autre jour un de mes amis, le Marquis de Lothian,¹ avec qui je causais sur ce sujet, 'l'idée seule de mettre fin au schisme du seizième siècle est si belle, si transportante, qu'on peut à peine s'imaginer ce que ce serait de la voir réalisée.' On dirait que le monde se prépare pour quelque événement pareil. Tous les hommes, tous les pays se rapprochent par l'extension de la presse, les chemins de fer, le télégraphe. Tout le monde se précipite à l'étranger, les divisions s'effacent : on commence à se connaître, c'est la moitié, et plus de la moitié du chemin accomplie. Il me semble aussi que toutes ces questions sociales qui se font sentir partout, même ces grèves internationales, travaillent dans le même sens, et que Dieu prépare pour notre Europe ou un cataclysme affreux, peut-être le commencement de la fin, ou que la religion catholique s'emparera encore des masses, comme elle l'a fait des Barbares, et ne laissera rien à regretter des Siècles de Foi. Il se pourrait bien aussi que de grands troubles extérieurs fussent les moyens par lesquels, dans les desseins de Dieu, ce rapprochement se fera, et s'il en est ainsi, qu'ils viennent, et qu'ils viennent vite, et que notre Seigneur nous donne la force et la grâce de nous comporter comme il le faudra dans de telles épreuves. La première chose, c'est de nous connaître, la seconde, de désirer l'union avec tout notre cœur, de juger tout ce qui a été fait et dit dans le passé, tout ce qu'on dit et fait maintenant d'un côté et de l'autre, de la manière la plus indulgente, tout en ne sacrifiant pas la vérité. Surtout, il faut beaucoup d'explications. Je suis absolument convaincu qu'entre vous et nous il n'y a rien dans tout ce qui rattache à la doctrine des Sacrements, du Purgatoire, de l'Invocation des Saints, au culte, à la confession, au Sacerdoce, qui ne pourrait être arrangé avec la plus grande facilité, si de chaque côté on voulait s'expliquer, et insister seulement sur ce qui est de foi, en permettant un *plus* et un *moins* pour toute autre chose. Les Grecs et les Latins se servent également du mot *Transubstantiation* pour exprimer la doctrine de la Présence Réelle. La manière dont ils traitent le Saint Sacrement 'extra usum' est absolument différente. Permettez un procédé semblable pour d'autres choses, et on aurait d'un coup mis de côté les trois quarts des difficultés qui empêchent la paix. Evidemment aucune partie de l'Eglise ne peut contredire directement ce qu'elle a dit, mais avec le temps on voit que certaines

¹ Schomberg Henry, ninth Marquis of Lothian, died 7th February 1900.

paroles, certaines formules, n'avaient pas toute la portée qu'on voulait y trouver, et qu'il y a place pour des explications qui permettent un rapprochement qu'on trouvait autrefois impossible. Par exemple, si la définition du Concile du Vatican peut à la rigueur être prise dans le sens que le Pape est *seulement* infallible quand il a pris tous les moyens nécessaires pour s'informer de ce qui est l'enseignement de l'Eglise, et qu'il est infallible seulement quand il promulgue ce qui est l'enseignement de l'Eglise, évidemment il y aurait moyen de s'accommoder sur un sujet où il paraissait, il y a peu de temps, que tout arrangement était impossible. De même avec d'autres questions.

Mais pour tout ceci il faut que nous nous connaissions. Les hommes sont conduits beaucoup plus par le cœur que par la tête, et surtout, il faut que vous autres, vous essayiez de bien comprendre notre position. Avec raison ou non, nous trouvons qu'il y a beaucoup de choses à dire sur le schisme du seizième siècle, que les torts ne sont pas tous d'un côté, que, s'ils ne sont pas tous d'un côté, la responsabilité du schisme et les conséquences qui en découlent ne peuvent pas être toutes mises sur nos épaules ; que, sans doute, nous devrions être en communion visible avec le Pape, mais, qu'il ne suit pas de là—les faits étant tels qu'ils sont—que l'interruption de cette Communion ait détruit la Grâce des Sacrements, et nous ait réduits à la position d'une secte protestante.

On pourrait décrire la position de la façon suivante : ceux en Angleterre qui sont en communion avec Rome ne le sont pas avec l'épiscopat local, et ceux qui sont en communion avec l'épiscopat local ne le sont pas avec le Saint Siège, et rien ne peut marcher jusqu'à ce que ceux qui forment ces deux Communions soient réunis. Pour cela, il ne faut pas seulement viser à des conversions individuelles, qui ne servent à rien au point de vue général, mais à la réunion de l'Eglise anglicane entière avec Rome. Après tout, il n'y a qu'une Eglise véritable au monde, et si nos prétentions sont justes, quoique séparés de Rome, nous sommes déjà, et à l'heure qu'il est, membres de cette seule Eglise. Sans doute pour faire cette paix il y a des difficultés innombrables. Il y a mille choses chez nous qui vous choqueraient affreusement ; mais, avec Dieu tout est possible, et si Léon XIII. voulait sérieusement s'occuper d'un tel rapprochement, qui pourrait prédire ce qui en résulterait ? Seulement, comme nous avons dit, il faut commencer peu à peu, et la considération de la validité de nos ordres est bien le point par où il faut com-

mencer. Mais vous comprendrez facilement qu'il y aurait une grande répugnance ici à soumettre la question de nos ordres à ceux qui les déclareraient nuls pour des raisons semblables à celles qu'on tirerait du décret d'Eugène IV. aux Arméniens, ou parce que jusqu'ici l'Eglise romaine les aurait traités comme *nuls*. Les vôtres ici, ou plutôt, parmi les vôtres ici, il y en a plusieurs qui ne demandent pas mieux que de faire tout en leur pouvoir pour déclarer nos ordres nuls, trouvant que c'est une manière facile et expéditive de fermer une controverse qui, autrement, n'est pas si facile à conduire. Et pour que les nôtres se mettent de grand cœur dans cette question, il faudrait qu'ils fussent bien assurés que la question serait traitée comme, par exemple, la traiterait l'abbé Duchesne. Je ne dis pas cela parce qu'il y a des raisons de croire qu'il nous serait favorable, mais parce qu'on le sait incapable de chercher autre chose que la vérité vraie, sans aucune idée du parti qu'on pourrait tirer d'un côté ou d'un autre de ses conclusions.

Si, par exemple, LÉON XIII. (vous me permettez, cher ami, de monter un peu dans les nuages), comme Père de la Chrétienté, adressait une lettre aux archevêques de Canterbury et d'York, et aux évêques anglais, comme représentants de *fait* de l'ancien épiscopat national, leur rappelant les heureux temps antérieurs au schisme, alors que tous étaient unis sous la Primauté de celui qui, du point de vue anglican, est au moins le Patriarche de l'Occident et le premier évêque de l'Eglise catholique, leur assurant qu'il ne désire rien au monde autant que la cessation du schisme, et que pour cela la première chose serait de traiter à fond la question des ordres; s'il donnait l'assurance qu'on mettrait de côté pour le moment, toute considération de la nature du lien qui devrait exister entre le reste de l'Eglise et le Saint Siège, et que, dans cette question des ordres, on regarderait seulement ce qui constitue la matière et la forme essentielle d'après l'enseignement de l'Eglise entière, et le fait historique de la succession: si son langage témoignait du plus grand désir de reconnaître la validité des ordres anglicans, je suis persuadé que de tous les côtés l'effet serait magnifique, et qu'il est impossible de prédire le résultat qu'une pareille démarche pourrait avoir. Ayons un peu d'imagination, un peu de foi. Pour les grands résultats il faut bien tenter quelque chose. Dieu s'est fait homme pour sauver le monde. Le Saint Père, il me semble, pour l'union des Eglises, pourrait faire des démarches qu'on ne pourrait demander à nul autre qu'à lui. Qu'est-ce qu'un père

ne doit pas faire pour le salut de ses enfants ? Oh ! il faut jeter loin de nous les conventions, les entraves, tout ce qui empêche ces démarches qu'on aime à appeler des folies, mais qui sont la vraie sagesse. L'âge des miracles n'est pas passé, et si jamais un Pape eût le droit d'agir de cette façon c'est bien Léon XIII., qui a exercé une si grande attraction sur toutes les âmes.

Je vous adresse cette lettre à la hâte ; je doute si vous allez la déchiffrer, mais le temps manque, et il faut qu'elle parte telle quelle.

J'arrive à Londres de la campagne ; je trouve votre lettre. Au sujet de votre lettre, j'hésite. Il serait peut-être plus sage que vous remettiez votre voyage en Angleterre jusqu'à l'année prochaine. Nous aurions plus de temps pour préparer les esprits ici : on marche lentement chez nous. Mais c'est absolument comme vous voulez. Si vous êtes de cet avis, je crois pouvoir vous rencontrer pour trois ou quatre jours à Paris, où j'arriverai samedi, 20. Si, au contraire, vous croyez mieux de venir en Angleterre, pourquoi ne pas venir ici le 23 ou le 24, passer quelques semaines avec nous ?

Le livre¹ sur nos ordres qu'on traduit en latin est presque fini. Faudrait-il faire aussi une traduction en français, ou le latin, suffit-il ?

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

CAHORS, 14 juillet 1894.

Au reçu de votre lettre, je me décide à partir pour Paris demain soir. Pourquoi n'y viendriez vous pas, même dans l'hypothèse où nous jugerions mon voyage en Angleterre utile ? Votre visite aurait sûrement de l'importance et des résultats. De plus, nous déciderions ensemble s'il est préférable d'attendre à l'année prochaine ou de passer La Manche cette année. Mon but était d'aller travailler chez vous, et de rapporter les matériaux d'une série d'articles sur l'état actuel de l'Eglise anglicane. Je n'ai rien à faire auprès de vos archevêques ou évêques, étant sans autorité et sans mission. Pour la controverse, un séjour d'une quinzaine à Paris me suffira, d'autant plus que je ne suis nullement pressé de répondre, j'aime mieux attendre que d'autres travaux aient paru. Le Professeur Gasparri² m'écrit aujourd'hui

¹ *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, by Mr. Denny and Mr. Lacey.

² Professor at the *Institut Catholique* in Paris, afterwards a member of the Commission appointed by Leo XIII. to report on the question of English Orders; now Cardinal.

qu'il a vu M. Périès, professeur de droit canon à l'Université catholique de Washington. Ce monsieur se propose d'aller à Londres pour étudier la question des Ordres. Dès mon arrivée à Paris, je tâcherai d'entrer en relations avec lui. En tout cas, si je ne puis le rencontrer, je lui écrirai. Voici une idée qui me hante depuis près d'un an, vous y penserez, et vous me direz si vraiment elle est folle. Comme vous le dites dans votre très belle lettre, la première condition pour s'unir c'est de se connaître. Quel moyen pourrait-on employer pour arriver à se connaître ? Le moyen à mon avis le plus simple serait de créer à Paris une Revue rédigée en français, qui aurait pour titre *L'Union des Eglises*, et pour but immédiat, de faire connaître les différentes communions. Son procédé unique serait l'exposition, toute controverse serait bannie. La réussite paraît certaine ; la dépense pour une première année serait minime, je me chargerais de la moitié. Je n'hésiterais pas, si nous jugions le projet réalisable et utile, à prier mes supérieurs de me remplacer à Cahors et de me laisser à Paris. Les articles ne manqueraient point pour chez vous, et j'arriverais, je crois, assez facilement, à trouver des écrivains pour d'Eglise grecque, et les différents schismes de l'Eglise d'Orient. Pensez y, et nous en causerons.

Inutile je crois de donner des traductions françaises du travail dont vous me parlez sur les ordinations anglicanes.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

16 juillet 1894.

Si vous venez en Angleterre cette année, pour que votre visite vous soit utile, il faut venir *tout de suite*, c'est-à-dire, arriver ici *vendredi* prochain, pas plus tard. Vous resterez ici avec moi à Londres quelques jours, je vous ferai voir Oxford, Salisbury, Windsor, et ce qu'il y a à voir à Londres : les maisons des sœurs, etc., etc. A la fin de la semaine vous viendrez avec moi à la campagne ; vous passerez par Cambridge, Lincoln et Durham. Vous verrez aussi York, et j'arrangerai pour avoir à peu près trois semaines à votre disposition. Il me semble que dans cet espace de temps, vous pourriez facilement trouver beaucoup de matériaux pour des articles. Au mois d'août l'évêque de Lincoln est absent, et après le milieu du mois tout le monde est en vacances. Aussi, si vous ne venez pas tout de suite, je crois qu'il sera mieux de remettre votre voyage à une autre année.

Envoyez-moi une dépêche pour dire si vous venez vendre ou *non* ; si *non*, je ferai de mon mieux pour venir à Paris pour deux ou trois jours.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, juillet 1894.

Je viens de vous envoyer une dépêche pour vous annoncer ma visite en Angleterre. Après celle que vous avez reçue hier, elle vous surprendra beaucoup. Voici l'explication de ma conduite. Quand j'ai reçu votre lettre du 16, je n'avais pas encore vu notre supérieur général. Je ne pouvais pas le voir dans la journée du lendemain, et il m'était impossible, par conséquent, de vous donner une réponse satisfaisante ; de plus, votre lettre ne me donnait pas le temps de voir à Paris les personnes qu'il me paraissait indispensable de voir avant d'aller chez vous. Je vous ai donc répondu *non*. Mais ce matin j'ai causé assez longuement avec notre supérieur général, et à moins de me dire lui-même d'aller en Angleterre, il ne pouvait pas se montrer plus favorable.

En outre, ces jours derniers, j'ai vu des rédacteurs du *Monde* et de l'*Univers*. Ils sont tout disposés à entrer dans nos vues et à mener campagne avec nous. M. Levé, le directeur du *Monde*, avec qui j'ai causé très longuement, s'est mis à ma disposition pour faire parvenir au Cardinal Rampolla par une personne amie et sûre, un petit mémoire que j'écrirais sur notre question. J'ai également acquis la certitude que par le *Moniteur de Rome* j'arriverai aussi au Cardinal Rampolla et au Pape.

Il n'y a donc plus qu'à marcher. Dans mon mémoire je me servirai beaucoup de votre lettre, et je vous nommerai, si vous n'y voyez pas d'inconvénient. Si vous croyez avoir d'autres indications utiles à me fournir, envoyez-les-moi par retour du courrier.¹

L'abbé Duchesne a publié son article,² je vous l'envoie, il est

¹ The Abbé did not, I think, himself actually write the memorandum which he wished transmitted to Cardinal Rampolla in order that the Cardinal, if he thought fit, might express his approval of the sentiments in the direction of peace and reunion expressed at the end of the Abbé's pamphlet. The memorandum was, I believe, in fact written by M. Goyau, *agrégé* of the French University, who was personally much appreciated by Leo XIII., from some notes of the Abbé, and in it mention was made of my letter of the 11th of July. It was transmitted to Cardinal Rampolla by M. Henri Lorin.

² In the *Bulletin Critique* of 15th July.

parfait pour nous. Malheureusement ce monsieur a quitté Paris pour aller prendre ses vacances.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, juillet 1894.

Comme je vous l'ai écrit, il m'était impossible de vous arriver le 20. J'avais même renoncé à exécuter mon voyage cette année, mais mon supérieur à qui je ne demandais ma permission qu'en riant, et sous forme dubitative, m'a répondu avec tant de spontanéité, que je n'ai pas cru devoir refuser. Si plus tard, l'année prochaine, par suite de changements toujours possibles, il ne m'avait pas été permis de vous venir, j'en aurais eu d'amers regrets. En arrivant sur terre anglaise, je me remettrai entre vos mains. Si vous avez des engagements, vous me laisserez à Hickleton avec le père Puller ou avec vos livres seuls, et je ne m'ennuierai pas. Mais la visite du père Puller aurait été ici à peu près inutile, car pour travailler il me faut vos livres. Je ne tiens pas du tout à m'arrêter à Londres.

J'ai vu hier l'abbé Boudinhon, il sera des nôtres. Je verrai demain M. de Pressensé, qui s'intéresse beaucoup à la question anglicane. M. de Pressensé est attaché au journal *Le Temps*.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, DONCASTER, juillet 1894.

Tout s'arrange admirablement, et je suis content, content, mais plus que content de songer que je vais vous voir et que vous venez chez moi ; c'est une vraie joie.

Nous dînerons ensemble lundi. Mardi nous irons à Windsor, peut-être y coucherons-nous. Il y a une grande maison de sœurs là, que vous devriez voir. Nous irons mercredi à Oxford. Je voudrais vous conduire à Bristol, à Cambridge et à Lincoln, et après nous viendrions ici et nous rejoindrions Lady Halifax et Lady Beauchamp qui sont au bord de la mer.

J'écris au Père Puller pour lui demander s'il peut vous joindre ici pour quelques jours. Et j'écris aussi à l'évêque de Lincoln pour lui demander quand il sera chez lui. Vous ne savez pas comme je suis heureux à la pensée de votre visite. C'est un rêve réalisé.

I see by a reference to my Diary that the Abbé Portal arrived in London on Monday, the 30th of July. In

England he had been my guest. His first visit was to Father Foster, at the church in Palace Street, Buckingham Gate, with whom he arranged to say Mass while he was in London, and with whom we had some conversation. The next day Tuesday (31st) I took him to East Grinstead, where he saw the convent, and had tea with the chaplain. The next day he saw the Church of St. Augustine, Kilburn, St. Peter's Sisterhood, the Sisters of the Church, and St. Alban's, Holborn; he paid a visit to the Rev. Edward Russell, and to the Sisters of Bethany in Lloyd Square, where he had a long conversation with the Superior, whom he described afterwards as quite at home in all the details and difficulties of conventual life, and, in his own phrase, '*c'est une fine mouche*,' or, as we should say, 'as sharp as a needle.' He also saw the Church Missionary College at Islington and the Rev. T. W. Drury, then head of the college, subsequently the head of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and now Bishop of Sodor and Man. He looked in at St. Paul's, where Evensong was being sung, afterwards paying a visit to the Bishop of Salisbury at Lambeth, who showed him the palace and library. On his way home he saw the Churches of St. John the Divine and St. Agnes, Kennington. Thursday, the 2nd August, we went to Windsor and Eton. He visited the Priory at Ascot, and the Sisterhood founded by Miss Sellon, where he was received by the old Superioress, the sister of Lord Napier and Ettrick, who told him about Dr. Pusey's death, and showed him the Rule of her house. He ended up with Evensong at St. George's, after which Canon Courtenay showed him over the interior of the Castle, and took him to see the Sisterhood at Clewer. Friday he paid a visit to Bristol, where he saw the house of the Sisters of Charity, and was introduced to their warden, the Rev. Arthur H. Ward. Saturday and Sunday, the 4th and 5th August, he visited the hospital in Osnaburgh Street, All Saints Church, and the All Saints Sisterhood. He said Mass on the Sunday at St. Edward's, Palace Street, visited St. Mary's, Graham Street and St. Matthew's, Westminster, and in the afternoon went down to Hampton Court, where he had tea with my aunt, Lady Georgiana

Grey. Monday, the 6th, he went to Cambridge, where he was received at Trinity by Dr. Cunningham, now Archdeacon of Ely, saw the Rev. T. A. Lacey and the Rev. E. G. Wood, called on Mr. Cobb, the author of *The Kiss of Peace*, and then went on to Ely, where Canon Randolph showed him over the Theological College and the Cathedral. In the evening we went on to the Palace at Peterborough, where we stayed the night. The Abbé had a long conversation with the Bishop.¹ He began by dwelling on the friendly dispositions in France, and of the general ignorance which prevailed abroad upon English affairs, and expressed the opinion that owing to the initiative taken by Leo XIII. in regard to the Eastern Churches, there was a good opportunity for doing something to diminish this ignorance. The Bishop spoke of the necessity of a serious study of history, as in order to understand the doctrinal statements of the Church of England it was necessary to be acquainted with the general theological position previous to the Council of Trent, and not to import into the judgment of what was said and done in the sixteenth century considerations really determined by events and convictions belonging to a later period. No one, the Bishop said, questioned the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. The Abbé asked :—

‘ Would you admit that Councils are a means to determine the truth of which the Church is the depository ? ’

‘ Certainly,’ said the Bishop.

‘ Would you admit that the Pope, after taking all necessary means to determine what that truth was, might also proclaim it ? ’

The Bishop assented.

‘ In order that such truth should be recognised as part of the deposit of the Faith, would it be necessary that the Church should accept it by a formal act ? ’

‘ Not necessarily,’² said the Bishop.

¹ The Rt. Rev. Mandell Creighton, afterwards Bishop of London.

² If my memory serves me, Dr. Pusey, in the *Eirenicon*, in reference to the same subject, points out how largely what is the accepted doctrine of the Church on the subject of grace and freewill had been formulated by St. Augustine, and had come to be accepted as the faith of the Church without the intervention of any General Council.

The Abbé expressed the pleasure it gave him to hear such sentiments, as it showed the possibility of coming to an understanding. To which the Bishop replied that he often told his own people that they did not understand what they were saying when they talked about the Pope, and that it might be useful for them to remember, when discussing Papal infallibility, that it was an axiom in England that 'the King can do no wrong.' There was some further conversation in regard to the schism of the sixteenth century. The Bishop was struck by what the Abbé told him of the mind of people in France, and I remember interjecting that the last time I had seen Cardinal Newman and talked to him on the subject of reunion, he said to me : ' You will find much more sympathy in France than you will in England on that subject.' At the close of the conversation the Bishop asked if the Abbé had seen the Archbishop of Canterbury, adding : ' He must see the Archbishop.'

The next morning the Bishop showed him all over the Cathedral. From there we went on to York, where the Archbishop of York met us at the station, and took us to Bishopthorpe. As an opening to the conversation he showed the Abbé the *Life of St. Charles Borromeo*, and the *Life of Mgr. Dupanloup*. ' I try,' he said, ' to inspire myself with the spirit of St. Charles, and as for Mgr. Dupanloup, I have tried to organise my diocese on his model, and I think if he were in my place he would be able to govern it very much as he governed the diocese of Orleans, and would not find much difference. The Archbishop then spoke of the Encyclical of Leo XIII., saying it was impossible not to be touched by the sight of the Pope at his age making this appeal to the charity of Christians. ' It makes me think,' he said, ' of St. John, and it is our duty to do all we can to further his wishes.' He then asked the Abbé to speak quite freely to him. The Abbé again spoke of the general ignorance abroad touching the Church of England : that the line taken by Leo XIII. was a great opportunity for the Church of England to make its position clear, that the

Catholic press in France would second any such efforts; the occasion ought to be seized, and the Church of England ought to vindicate its belief in regard to the Sacraments, etc., and its desire for union. In consequence of the action of Leo XIII., every one was looking to the East, but that after all reunion with England was more important. The Archbishop asked what the French bishops would think of such a movement, to which the Abbé replied that they would think on that subject as the Pope did. The conversation ended with the expression on the part of the Archbishop of how great a duty it was to try to realise our Lord's prayer before His Passion, the Archbishop adding: 'Let us hope and trust that we are at the beginning of something really great in the interests of the Church.' I mentioned the advice of the Bishop of Peterborough that the Abbé should see the Archbishop of Canterbury. 'Yes,' said the Archbishop of York, 'he should certainly see the Archbishop of Canterbury.'

The Abbé came away from Bishopthorpe much pleased, saying to me: '*C'est la note d'une grande piété qui distingue cette maison.*' The next few days he stayed with us, and on the 10th or 11th August, I received the following note from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was then at Addington:—

'I shall be glad to see M. Dalbus,¹ if you could be so kind as to bring him to a dismantled house. The particle of shyness I feel is lest he should have his ability to help his people weakened, if he is known to visit ecclesiastics here, when he finds himself again among friends of the candour of Cardinal Bourret. And we also must not be supposed to receive "emissaries," . . . but he could not misunderstand our position, I imagine.'

Some reason prevented the Abbé from seeing the Archbishop on the day named, and there had also been a question of his seeing Cardinal Vaughan. Writing from London, where I had gone for business in the House of Lords, I tell the Abbé, who was still in Yorkshire, that there was nothing from the Cardinal, and, in a later letter, that the

¹ The name under which the Abbé had written his pamphlet.

Archbishop had asked us both to breakfast at Addington on the 15th.

On Tuesday, the 14th, I went to see the Cardinal, and discovered that he had been expecting the Abbé, and had arranged for Canon Moyes and Mr. Edward Bishop to meet him at luncheon. I told the Cardinal how much I regretted the mistake if it was due to me, but that the Abbé was not in London, though I believed he was coming up that night. I dined at the House of Lords with the Archbishop and Lord Stanmore, and found the Abbé just arrived from Hickleton when I returned home late in the evening. The next morning we went down to Addington, arriving there for breakfast. The Archbishop had a long conversation with the Abbé, who repeated very much what he had said to the Bishop of Peterborough and the Archbishop of York. The Archbishop was, however, very reserved: it was obvious that he was afraid of being accused of receiving emissaries from Rome. In the course of the conversation the Abbé Duchesne was mentioned, and something was said on the revival of historical study among the French clergy. The Encyclical *Providentissimus* in regard to biblical exegesis was alluded to, the Abbé insisting on the necessity for prudence in regard to discussions relating to the Higher Criticism, the Archbishop, if I remember right, seeming to think that in the eventual interests of truth, it was wiser to face the whole question without any fear of consequences. Towards the end of the meeting the Archbishop became less reserved, and in regard to reunion said we must all wish for it and work for it, but we must also remember that there were different parties in the Church of England, and as Head of that Church he must be careful to say and do nothing which might provoke a schism. The conversation ended by his thanking the Abbé for his vindication of the doctrine of the Church of England in regard to the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and saying, 'I hope that these matters will not end with your visit here.'

In the afternoon, owing to an engagement which could not be postponed, we were obliged to go back to Hickleton, where we found Father Puller. The next day Mr. Wilfrid

Ward arrived. I remember him speaking of the *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*, upon which he was engaged, and hinting that the ideas of Cardinal Wiseman were not altogether those of Cardinal Manning or Cardinal Vaughan. There was much conversation that evening, and the next day ; I think it was generally admitted that an opportunity had presented itself for working for reunion, but that such reunion could not be the work of to-day or to-morrow, inasmuch as I and those who sympathized with me only represented a comparatively small party in the Church of England ; a remark which led to my observing that great movements were generally the work of minorities, and that this was a matter which had to be looked at in the light of faith, rather than in that of human calculation.

The following day Mr. Ward left. The Abbé left also, going with Father Puller to the House of the Cowley Fathers at Oxford, on his way back to Paris.

A day or two later, Mr. Ward, writing from Eastbourne, expressed what 'a real satisfaction' it had been to him to see members of the French Church enter into English affairs in such a sympathetic spirit. . . . 'Once a thoroughly fair and sympathetic spirit comes to exist among us all, the truth will gradually be got at on all sides. Our people have very much to learn. It is curious,' he added, 'how fifty years ago Cardinal Wiseman alone took the sympathetic view of the situation which I rejoice to see is spreading.'

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, 18 août 1894.

Je me trouve tout triste de votre départ ; mais la vie est ainsi.

Maintenant, les lieux et les espaces n'ont rien à faire avec les choses du cœur et pour ceux qui s'aiment en notre Seigneur Jésus Christ la séparation n'existe pas.

Pour l'œuvre, sans doute il y a des difficultés immenses. Mais il ne faut pas les regarder du point de vue humain. Si Dieu le veut, l'œuvre s'accomplira tôt ou tard ; et nous n'avons autre chose à faire que d'agir dans la direction qu'il semble indiquer, et avec les moyens qu'il nous a donnés. J'aime à me rappeler

que, malgré tout ce qu'on dit ici bas, 'ceux qui sont pour nous sont plus que ceux qui sont contre nous.' Le monde invisible est de notre côté, et tous ceux qui sont morts dans l'espérance de voir un jour la paix de l'Eglise prient pour nous. Ce que Notre Seigneur ne nous accorderait peut-être pas à cause de nos péchés, il nous le donnera pour leurs mérites et leurs sacrifices. Ainsi soit-il. Une fois encore je vous remercie du plus profond de mon cœur pour tout ce que vous faites. Souvenez-vous de moi, cher ami, quelquefois dans vos prières, et soyez bien sûr que je suis toujours et plus que jamais, tout à vous.

On his return to France, while he was giving a Retreat at Libourne, the Abbé received an intimation from Cardinal Rampolla that it was the Pope's wish that he should go to Rome.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

LIBOURNE, 29 août 1894.

La lettre que je reçois est trop importante pour que je ne vous la communique pas immédiatement. Je vous ai parlé du Directeur du *Monde*, M. Levé, comme s'étant intéressé particulièrement à nos affaires. Je vous ai dit que ce monsieur m'avait demandé un rapport pour le faire passer par une personne sûre au Cardinal Rampolla. Pendant que j'étais en Angleterre, M. Lorin,¹ la personne sûre, est venu à Paris. M. Levé lui a communiqué mon rapport, votre lettre. M. Lorin a envoyé les documents au Cardinal Rampolla en les accompagnant d'une lettre. Réponse: Le Cardinal prie M. Lorin de me conseiller un voyage à Rome et exprime l'espoir que ce voyage se fera le plus tôt possible. Je n'ai pas hésité une minute. J'ai transmis tous les documents à mon Supérieur Général en lui demandant la permission d'aller à Rome. S'il me permet je partirai vers le 8.

Je suis à Libourne jusqu'au 5 septembre, le 6 je serai à Cahors pour en repartir probablement le 8, toujours dans le cas où j'irais à Rome. Si j'y vais, je parlerai au Cardinal Rampolla et au Pape comme j'ai parlé aux vôtres. Je leur dirai tout ce que j'ai vu et entendu avec la plus grande franchise. Naturellement, je m'enhardirai jusqu'à dire ce qu'il faudrait faire.

¹ M. Henri Lorin, a friend of Cardinal Rampolla's. See p. 94, Letter from the Abbé Portal.

Léon XIII. est si bon et si intelligent qu'il me laissera parler. Il me semble qu'après avoir poussé les vôtres à faire connaître leur désir d'union, il faut pousser les nôtres dans le même sens. Vous me le disiez dans votre lettre, il faut quelque chose de grand de notre part et qui produise un grand éclat. Sainte Thérèse, qui n'avait pas été élevée à Cambridge,¹ disait : 'Thérèse n'est rien, Thérèse et quelques ducats ce n'est pas grand'chose, Thérèse quelques ducats et Dieu c'est tout.' Elle ne disait pas deux et deux font quatre. Je soutiendrai en face de tous les docteurs de Cambridge que jamais deux et deux ne font quatre dans les choses de Dieu : ils font plus ou moins. Faute de papier j'arrête là ma dissertation.

PS.—Je reprends une nouvelle feuille, car il ne faut pas cependant que la lettre du Cardinal me fasse tout oublier. J'ai vu notre Supérieur général à Dax. Il a été bien surpris de tout ce que je lui ai dit et vous auriez été bien étonné de ses réflexions. L'essentiel est qu'il m'a permis d'écrire le livre ² et secondement qu'il m'a permis de vous donner rendez-vous à la Maison mère pour le 2^e dimanche après Pâques.

Vous avez dû recevoir dix exemplaires de *La Vérité*. J'ai vu M. Arthur Loth ³ qui est un homme infiniment respectable et de grande foi. Lui aussi a été bien étonné de tout ce que je lui ai dit de vous autres.

PPS.—M. Lorin est homme à faire le voyage à Rome, si c'est nécessaire. Vos occupations vous le permettraient-elles, si nous le jugions utile ? Pensez-y.⁴

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

LIBOURNE, 2 septembre 1894.

M. Levé et M. Lorin pensent qu'une entrevue entre M. Lorin et moi est nécessaire. Je le crois aussi. Je voulais demander à M. Lorin de venir à Cahors, réflexion faite je vais lui donner rendez-vous à Paris pour jeudi 6 septembre, et voici pourquoi. Je me demande, mon cher ami, si votre présence à ce rendez-vous ne serait pas nécessaire. Je crois qu'elle serait du moins grande-

¹ A playful 'hit' at Father Puller, prompted by Dr. Bright's remark 'that the one irreparable misfortune was to have been brought up at Cambridge.'

² On the Church of England.

³ Editor of *La Vérité*, and the writer of an article on the Church of England published in that journal.

⁴ The Abbé obtained leave to go to Rome two days later.

ment utile. Songez que M. Lorin verra bientôt le Cardinal et Léon XIII., et qu'il y a un intérêt majeur, par conséquent, à ce qu'il vous connaisse. A Rome ils chercheront à se renseigner sur vous ; quand M. Lorin pourra dire, 'J'ai vu Lord Halifax,' vous comprendrez que l'effet des paroles sera bien plus grand. Toutefois, mon cher ami, il est possible que vous ne puissiez pas venir, soit parce que vous aurez des engagements, soit pour tout autre motif. Aussi je ne vous annoncerai pas à ces messieurs avant d'avoir une réponse ferme de vous ; répondez à cette lettre par télégramme. Pensez, mon cher ami, qu'à nous deux nous faisons toujours de la bonne besogne, et que Dieu vous inspire. Notre rendez-vous doit être chez M. Levé, 17, Rue Cassette.

In consequence of the Abbé's letter, I left London for Paris Friday night, the 7th September, and arrived there on Saturday at 8 A.M., spent the day with the Abbé, M. Levé, and M. Lorin, and left again for London at 9 P.M., the Abbé starting the same evening for Rome.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE,

dimanche, 9 septembre 1894.

Je suis arrivé à Londres juste à temps pour courir à l'église, où j'ai communiqué et où j'ai beaucoup prié Notre Seigneur pour tout ce que vous allez faire à Rome et pour 'l'œuvre.' J'ai aussi beaucoup pensé à M. Levé. Seulement à le voir, à l'entendre, on comprend que la douceur, l'humilité, la bonté sont les seuls véritables biens, et qu'elles sont les choses qui remuent le monde. Je ne saurais vous dire à quel point je me sens attiré vers lui. Quand on est tout près des choses, il est difficile de comprendre leur grandeur et leur portée, mais sûrement c'est impossible qu'il y ait une chose plus grande que celle pour laquelle nous travaillons.

CHAPTER V

CARDINAL VAUGHAN'S ADDRESS AT PRESTON—THE ABBÉ PORTAL'S VISIT TO ROME—HIS SECOND VISIT TO ENGLAND AND HIS INTERVIEW WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

MEANWHILE Cardinal Vaughan had also been addressing himself to the question of reunion, as the following letter will show :—

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
September 7, 1894.

I see the *Tablet* announces a series of articles on Dalbus and Duchesne, also that the Cardinal¹ is to give an address next week on the reunion of Christendom. Do entreat him to say all he can to help what we desire. Men are led much more by their hearts than by their heads, and I am certain that a great work is to be done just now in the direction of peace if every one really wished for it, and would work for it in love and for love's sake, putting themselves in the position of those they want to win, and thinking only of our Lord, and nothing of their own side or of themselves.

The truth is the one and only thing we should all work to establish. And how can this be done, and our divisions healed except by making the very best of one another instead of the worst, going out of our way to make excuses and allowances for all we think we see amiss in others who seem to be opposed to us, and steadily resisting the temptation of taking advantage of this or that which may appear for the moment to support our own side. I am writing for dear life, but I can hardly tell you how anxious I am about what the Cardinal will say. I respect him so much, he might do so much, that I long to bring him and our people together, above all things I earnestly pray that

¹ Cardinal Vaughan.

nothing may be said just now which will rub people like the Archbishop of Canterbury the wrong way.

I always think that in these matters one wants a great deal of imagination to see the truth, and to do justice to other people.

In reply Mr. Ward¹ said that he wished he had got my note a day earlier, that he should not see the Cardinal before his address, and that he feared it might be too late now to write, as the address was on the following day. He was, however, writing direct to the Preston Town Hall on the chance. He sympathised with what I said, and though he did not feel 'sure of the Cardinal's appreciation of the situation,' he 'was sure of his good intentions.'

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
September 16, 1894.

I have just finished reading the Cardinal's address in the *Tablet*, which I suppose may be assumed to be a correct version of what was said.

I see it would be impossible to say in the compass of such a letter as I can write to-day all that I think has to be said about it. I shall try and do this later. Meanwhile, my first impression is confirmed; I cannot think the Cardinal's utterance—except indirectly, and because God overrules much that seems likely to work one way in another, and very different one—at all calculated to do good, or likely to do anything but harm to the great objects he himself wishes to promote.

It shows that he does not understand the position of those whom he is addressing, that in consequence, I feel sure without meaning it, he has contrived to say not only just the things which will irritate them most, but the very things (I refer to the paragraph 'Prospects of Reunion') most likely to impede the progress and throw difficulties in the way of all to which he himself alludes as causes of hope—one might almost think some of that paragraph was written to stir up Protestant prejudice against us. 'Submission' is not a happy word, but that apart, I doubt whether the address will promote 'individual submissions.' It certainly will not help 'corporate submission.' In

¹ Mr. Ward begs me to draw attention to a memorandum on the subject of his letters. (See Appendix III. p. 429.)

short, I am sorry, for I don't think the address worthy of its author. The same things in substance might have been said so differently. Nothing is done to make future progress easier, or to pave the way for explanations. It is all sharp, narrow, clear, and admirable just in proportion as people know less of all the bearings and extent of the question. *A priori* statements of what ought to be, unfortunately do not get over facts, and it seems to me there are not a few things in the address which are open to a damaging retort. But I can do no good by saying more to-day, only I am sad and disappointed.

The following are the more material parts of Cardinal Vaughan's Address :—

'One of the happiest signs of the times is the growing desire for the Reunion of Christendom. This noble aspiration manifests itself outside the Church. It recognises, at least in some degree, the incalculable evils which spring from the sin of schism. The pressure of grace and the Catholic instinct carry the minds of some still further. They ask themselves, What avails the exercise of many virtues by the soul that is an alien from unity and severed from the vine? They fear, with good reason, that their prayers and good works will not avail to salvation unless they are quickened with the life of the true vine, unless they are living members of the Body of Christ, which is His Church. With them the question of reunion is one of life or death. I do not venture to assert that all who take part in the movement for the reunion of Christendom are led by the Spirit of God, but there are many such. They attract and command our sympathy, and deserve all the assistance we can give them. Multitudes, to our knowledge, are held back only by domestic ties, and by the fear of hunger and poverty. Some of these, it is to be feared, seek refuge in the hope of a future corporate reunion, and endeavour to effect a compromise with conscience by adopting Catholic practices.

'Let me, therefore, make two brief statements. The Church cannot accept reunion on a basis of common formularies or creeds, while each one is left free to give to doctrines expressed in them his own meaning and interpretation. Unity must be based upon Christ as a living Divine Teacher. The Church cannot accept reunion or communion on the condition of change, or modification, or compromise in her own Divine constitution. The charter of her constitution was drawn up by her Divine

Founder. Such as He has built her upon a Rock, such in constitution she remains for ever. The invisible Rock is Christ, the visible Rock, Peter, constituted in one solidarity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable, and no man can change them.

‘No question of reunion can be seriously entertained without a recognition of the principle and the fact of unity. This unity is visible and tangible.

‘Contrast this with Anglicanism.

‘What, then, are the prospects of reunion? There can be only two bases of reunion so far as doctrine and authority are concerned.

‘(1) Compromise.

‘(2) Submission.

‘The first is inconsistent with the divine constitution of the Church: there remains only the second. Our hopes of a gradual submission by an ever-increasing number of Anglicans rest on the following evident facts:

‘1. The growing realisation of the Catholic, and therefore of the non-national, character of the Church of Christ, and the increasing distrust of national limitations in the idea of religion.

‘2. The growing appreciation of Catholic doctrines and devout practices, and a sensible diminution of the difficulties and prejudices that have hitherto obscured them. The doctrines of the Catholic Church, which had been rejected and condemned as blasphemous superstitions and fond inventions, have been re-examined and taken back, one by one, until the Thirty-nine Articles have been banished and buried as a rule of faith. The Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, offered for the living and the dead—sometimes even in Latin—not unfrequent reservation of the Sacrament, regular auricular confession, dispensations, extreme unction, Purgatory, prayers for the dead, devotions to our Lady, to her Immaculate Conception, the use of her rosary, and the invocation of saints, are doctrines taught and accepted, I am told, with a growing desire and relish for them, in the Church of England. A celibate clergy, the institution of monks and nuns under vows, retreats for the clergy, missions for the people, fasting and other penitential exercises—candles, lamps, incense, crucifixes, images of the Blessed Virgin and the saints held in honour, Stations of the Cross, cassocks, mitres, croziers, the adoption of an ornate Catholic ritual, and now recently an elaborate display of the whole ceremonial of the Catholic Ponti-

fical—all this speaks of a change and a movement towards the Church that would have appeared absolutely incredible at the beginning of this century. I know that it has been called Popery, or the Mass in masquerade—not without some reason. St. Jerome speaks of the devil as the *simia Dei*, the ape of God, so clever is he in counterfeiting the works and ordinances of God. Under the appearance of an angel of light he deceives many, especially those who are willing to be deceived. It may be so still. But, for my part, I prefer to hope and believe that we are witnessing, at least in a very large measure, an instance of the marvellous ways of divine grace, and that, if Satan be aping God, he is outwitting himself.'

After an allusion to the Donatists, the Cardinal went on :—

'What, then, do we at present desire for those who seek reunion? Not that they should come over to us blindly: we could not receive them thus, even were they to offer themselves. All we ask is this: that they would turn the eyes of their mind towards the City seated on the mountain; that they would break down the walls of prejudice which surround them; that they would examine and explore our claims with an open mind; that they would freely take evidence from Catholic priests and laymen, and read Catholic books; that they would cease to be guided and deluded by the enemies of the Catholic faith; that they would emancipate their souls from a servitude to individuals which hinders their approach to the Catholic Church; and especially that they would betake themselves to humble, fervent, and persevering prayer. The work of conversion and salvation is a work of God.'

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

MOLESCROFT, EASTBOURNE,

September 1894.

I have written to the Cardinal as strongly as I dare about the importance of entering into the point of view of Anglicans, and wishing that he had urged that in his speech. This seemed to me the only way I could put it. The two things that strike me are that (1) I am sure his intentions are the very best. He is simply talking as kindly as he can consistently with the old controversial tone of fifty years ago. Also (2) the main position he took up

might have been sustained without any offence if he had coupled it with a sympathetic recognition of your standpoint. I think there is real force and ability in the address, and that he writes it in the most single-hearted spirit, simply wishing to do good ; but the isolated intellectual life so many of our men lead (in England) necessarily issues (at times) in a tone unsuited to those readers whom they ought to influence. I wish I had more *locus standi*—not because I could give as able an address, but because I think I do see what could be said helpfully. But all I can do is to reserve what I have to say for Cardinal Wiseman's life, which, fortunately, will give me a good opportunity.

Writing again, Mr. Ward says :—

I want to add a few points to my last letter : (1) I am quite sure that so far as the Cardinal has failed, it is in art, and not in intention. All that I daily hear confirms me in this, and the note struck in the *Church Times* of last Friday is unfair and unworthy. Swaggering and ostentation are quite foreign to him. I know what is meant, but it is a curious misinterpretation. He is a true Englishman, and there is more mere bluntness of form than you fancy in sentences which have annoyed you, and which I myself agree with you in considering ill-judged. Hutton, who is himself blunt, says he can't see anything to annoy. I agree with you rather than with him on this point ; but his opinion is worth weighing.

(2) So far as the Cardinal's rather old-fashioned controversial groove—common also among many of your people—will allow it, I am sure he will do his best to show friendliness and to correct false impressions. I cannot say more until I have seen him. But I see throughout his speech the unselfish zeal of which he is full. He wants simply to do good, and I for one think that is in the long run more hopeful than more tact and less good intention. I have written him a very strong letter on the subject of candour and sympathy on the part of our people, and his wishing to consult me (knowing as he does my own general attitude) means, I am sure, more friendliness than you conceive. Remember it is our tradition to change fixed habits slowly, but I hope that this address with the comments it has evoked may, in the end, help by giving us all opportunity of speaking on the subject. I can't tell you how strongly I feel as to the one thing being candour, sympathy, and love of truth all round. Controversy is always passing into special pleading, and I believe that

the utmost fairness to all is compatible with seeing one's own point of view very clearly.

(3) I think that the passage about the 'ape, etc.,'¹ which I regretted, was simply the echo of what some men living with the Cardinal say, not about your representative men, but about a comparatively small group of ritualists, as they are called. But the passage following was the Cardinal's own feeling, all the more to be appreciated because of a certain early narrowness—even excessive narrowness—from which, through sheer goodness, he is emerging.

I don't think any of this is different from what I have already written, but I felt as though I had hardly done justice to my admiration for the Cardinal in spite of what I admit to be a certain want of tact. If his words are not always rightly chosen, he is nevertheless a leader of whom, for single-minded intention, one may well be proud. I take his joining the Bishop of Chester's Committee to be meant as an olive branch. I believe three sentences added to and three omitted from his address would have made all the difference. But the failure is in art and not in intention, and a great deal of the address has great force, as I believe you yourself will feel, if you read it apart from the sentences which tried you.

Mr. Ward's letters elicited a reply from me to the effect that though I did not doubt the Cardinal's intentions, and believed that he meant to be friendly, I felt that he had not put what he had to say in the best way; that it might have been said without raising the difficulties which I thought likely to be provoked; amongst them, how likely it was to interfere with the attitude I hoped the Archbishop of Canterbury would take up, and all I wanted him to do,

¹ Mr. Ward's explanation is scarcely borne out by the facts. The suggestion about the 'ape of God' is repeated in the *Risposta* presented to the Cardinals by Abbot Gasquet and Canon Moyes at the close of the Commission of 1896 (see p. 360), with the statement that it was one which had been recently made by a Catholic bishop in England:—

'Questa nuova situazione vien ben delineata colle parole recenti di un vescovo cattolico d'Inghilterra.' Dal tempo della Riforma il Demonio ha combattuto costantemente per mezzo dell'eresia la fede cattolica in Inghilterra, la osteggia apertamente e violentemente. Non avendo ottenuto un pieno intento ha mutato da quell'anno in poi la sua tattica, e combatte la Chiesa cattolica, imitandola ed usando contro di essa un travisamento delle sue dottrine, ed usurpando le sue pratiche trascina le anime semplici. Questa tattica è più terribile dell'altra, benchè colla grazia di Dio speriamo di sventarla. —*A Roman Diary*, p. 234.

both now and in the future. 'If anything,' I said, 'is to be done to promote reunion, the question must be approached with the desire to make the very best of both sides, with a determination to make all the excuses possible for what needs excuse, and with a real desire to see the *beau côté* of the opponents' position.' A great deal of chivalry and a great deal of imagination were wanted for this, much would also depend on the side from which the question of reunion was approached: was corporate reunion—submission, if he preferred the word—or individual submission the object aimed at? If individual conversions were the end in view, obviously the worse the Church of England could be made out to be, the better; if, on the other hand, corporate reunion was the end, then the more favourable the view it was possible to take of the Church of England, the easier such reunion would become, and the greater would be the desire to make all the allowances possible for the action of the English ecclesiastical authorities in the sixteenth century. It was the conviction that there was no desire to make the best of the Church of England, but on the contrary the worst, and the feeling of being misunderstood and unjustly treated, that did the real mischief.

To return to the Abbé Portal. He had left Paris for Rome the evening of the 8th September, and I heard from him immediately on his arrival.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

11 septembre 1894.

Je vous écris du *Moniteur de Rome* où je suis venu causer avec M. Monteuuis.¹ Tout à l'heure j'irai avec lui voir certains pères grecs et latins, pour parler *modo generali* des ordinations anglicanes. Ce matin, je suis allé au Vatican; ce soir à 7 heures j'y serai pour une entrevue avec le cardinal. Je vous écrirai demain pour vous en rendre compte.

Adieu, mon cher ami, à demain. Priez bien le bon Dieu pour

¹ Rédacteur of the *Moniteur de Rome*, in which he wrote under the name of 'Romanus.'

moi. Ce matin j'ai dit une prière aux tombeaux des Apôtres pour le succès de notre œuvre.

The Abbé was received by Cardinal Rampolla that evening. The Cardinal asked for an account of what had led the Abbé to interest himself in the question of reunion. The Abbé related the origin of his intimacy with me, and our desire to do something to promote the reunion of England with the Holy See. He spoke of the history of his pamphlet, of the Bishop of Salisbury's letter, of what he had seen and heard in Paris and of his journey to England. He dwelt on the Oxford Movement and its results, without in any way concealing the fact that there were many in England who were not in sympathy with it; adding that amongst those who represented the Oxford Movement the idea of reunion was well received. The Pope had taken a step in regard to the Eastern Churches, why should not a similar step be taken in regard to England? The conversation ended by the Cardinal saying he certainly thought there was something to be done, the question was, what; and he asked the Abbé to come back the next day, saying, 'Let us pray with all our hearts that God will help us in this affair.'

The details of the Abbé's interview with the Cardinal are contained in the following letter:—

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 12 septembre 1894.

J'ai vu hier au soir le cardinal Rampolla, je suis resté une bonne demi-heure avec lui. Après m'avoir remercié de mon empressement à me rendre à Rome, il m'a demandé comment je vous avais connu. J'ai dit nos relations de Madère, nos causeries sur les questions religieuses et comment nous avons été amenés à faire quelque chose pour l'union. J'ai parlé un peu de la brochure¹ et de ses résultats, de la lettre du Cardinal,² et de celle de l'évêque de Salisbury. J'ai parlé ensuite de notre campagne, de mes visites aux journaux de Paris, du *Moniteur de Rome* et de ma visite en Angleterre. Le cardinal ne connaissait rien de ce que nous avons fait là-bas. Je lui ai raconté nos

¹ 'Sur les Ordinations anglicanes.'

² Cardinal Bourret.

entrevues avec vos évêques. York a naturellement tenu la première place. J'ai dit avec la plus entière franchise tout ce que j'ai vu. J'ai fait l'éloge de vos religieuses, de votre épiscopat qui occupe une si haute place dans le mouvement intellectuel en Angleterre, d'une partie de votre clergé. J'ai dit aussi la position prise par les catholiques anglais.¹ Le cardinal m'a toujours encouragé à parler avec la plus entière franchise, même quand j'ai indiqué les torts que nous avions à votre endroit. Il m'a donné des marques d'un contentement vrai. A la fin, plusieurs fois, j'avais fait mine de m'en aller, disant que je ne voulais pas abuser et prendre trop de temps, que je pourrais écrire un rapport, à la fin il m'a dit : 'Oui, vous écrirez un rapport, mais je tiens à ce que vous voyez le Pape dès demain, vous ferez le rapport après, pour moi. Venez à onze heures trente, demain.' . . .

A l'heure dite, j'étais au Vatican ce matin. J'aurai mon audience ce soir à six heures. Je parlerai au Pape comme j'ai parlé au cardinal, avec la même simplicité. Hier, il me semblait être à York ! C'est tout dire, n'est-ce pas ? mon cher ami. Le cardinal m'a dit ces graves paroles : 'Il est évident qu'il y a quelque chose à faire, mais quoi, nous le cherchons. . . . Si eux nous facilitaient notre démarche' J'ai parlé d'un futur mandement de l'archevêque d'York. Mais j'ai ajouté, que le Pape avec des paroles simplement paternelles, sans rien compromettre, pouvait forcer vos évêques à parler. Si, ce soir, j'ai l'accueil que j'espère, je me hasarderai à émettre une proposition que je n'ose pas vous dire. Le Cardinal m'a encore répété ce matin, 'Parlez au Saint Père avec toute franchise et avec la plus entière liberté.'

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 13 septembre 1894.

Comme toujours les événements dépassent nos espérances. J'ai vu le Pape hier pendant près d'une heure. Il serait trop long de vous raconter en ce moment notre entrevue, je vous la dirai probablement de vive voix dans quelques jours. Il est, en effet, à peu près certain, que je serai à Londres dans quelques jours. Continuez à prier et à faire prier. Le bon Dieu est avec nous et il fera je crois de grandes choses.

PS.—Faites reproduire au plus tôt l'article du *Moniteur de Rome* du jeudi 13 septembre sur les Ordinations anglicanes.

¹ The abbé had had unmistakable evidence of this whilst in England.

Acknowledging the Abbé's letter, I said :—

J'ai beaucoup à vous dire, mais pour le moment je ne puis que remercier Notre Seigneur. Il me semble qu'il dirige tout. Le cardinal Vaughan a complètement manqué de savoir-faire dans ce qu'il a dit l'autre jour à Preston. Le malheur est qu'il manque absolument d'imagination.

C'est une sottise de nous dire tout court qu'il faut nous soumettre, soit comme individu, soit comme Eglise. Evidemment il y a, dans un certain sens, des choses auxquelles nous aurons à nous soumettre, mais il aurait bien pu l'exprimer autrement.

'Se soumettre' n'est pas un mot qui sonne bien dans les oreilles de qui que ce soit, surtout dans les oreilles d'un Anglais.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

Lundi, 17 septembre 1894.

Vous devez attendre bien impatiemment, mais vous connaissez Rome et si vous êtes étonné de quelque chose, ce n'est pas de sa lenteur dans les circonstances actuelles.

Dans l'audience que Léon XIII. m'accorda le lendemain de mon arrivée, le Pape qui m'avait écouté avec la plus grande attention et la plus grande sympathie devait, comme le Cardinal Rampolla, me poser la question sur ce qu'il y avait à faire. Je répondis : 'Si votre Sainteté voulait faire une démarche je suis sûr qu'elle obtiendrait de grands résultats.' 'Vraiment, et quelle démarche ?' Après quelques circonlocutions je formulais la proposition suivante : Sa Sainteté pourrait écrire une lettre privée et secrète aux archevêques d'York et de Canterbury, les invitant à travailler avec elle à l'union des Eglises. Je m'attendais à être arrêté net. Je constatais avec plaisir qu'à Rome on peut tout dire, le Pape m'encouragea à exposer mes idées. 'Cette lettre devrait être présentée comme une marque de déférence à l'égard des représentants de l'Eglise anglicane. Votre Sainteté pourrait dire qu'elle voulait d'abord s'adresser directement à l'Eglise anglicane d'une manière publique, mais qu'elle juge juste et prudent de s'adresser aux deux primats en premier lieu. Elle ferait sentir que si son appel n'était pas entendu, elle déchargerait sa responsabilité devant l'Eglise tout entière et devant Dieu. Cette lettre devrait être adressée aux deux archevêques parce que l'Archevêque de Canterbury, dont la position est exceptionnelle, serait nécessairement poussé par son collègue. Je suis sûr que les deux archevêques ne voudraient à aucun prix assumer

la responsabilité de rejeter de telles avances. Ils accepteraient donc quelques entrevues.'

'Et où pourraient se faire ces entrevues?' 'A Paris de préférence, très Saint Père.' 'Et pourquoi pas à Cahors?' Nous émettons nos idées là-dessus, et Rome, Paris, Cahors sont nommés et discutés. Le Saint Père s'animait et ses grands yeux vifs, profonds, les yeux d'un prophète, d'un voyant, semblaient sonder l'avenir. 'Et vous croyez que ma lettre sera reçue?' 'J'en suis sûr, très Saint Père, autant qu'on puisse l'être des choses humaines, et si vous voulez encore de mes services je l'apporterai moi-même.' Le Pape me paraissait tout à fait séduit par l'idée. Au fond Léon XIII. dans sa prudence italienne est un audacieux. 'Oui, mais une lettre du Pape si elle n'était pas reçue?' 'Elle sera reçue, très Saint Père, et, si par impossible, elle ne l'était pas, quelle force vous auriez, si dans quelque temps vous pouviez dire à l'Eglise entière: "Voilà ce que j'ai fait et j'ai été repoussé": le beau rôle serait de votre côté et, de plus, vos paroles détermineraient, j'en suis convaincu, un courant irrésistible dans l'église anglicane elle-même.' 'C'est vrai. . . . Eh bien! Oui j'écirai cette lettre. Oh! si l'union avec l'Eglise anglicane pouvait se faire. . . . Il me vient parfois des anglicans, qui sont bons, profondément religieux. Il en est venu un dernièrement qui m'a dit que le peuple en Angleterre était très religieux; il m'a parlé de Paris, de l'esprit d'impiété qui se répand de Paris' . . . et le Saint Père, avec un fin sourire, a ajouté. . . . 'Et j'ai parlé comme lui.'

En finissant ce sujet, je lui ai rapporté quelques paroles de l'archevêque d'York, entre autres celles-ci: 'Espérons que nous commençons de grandes choses.' 'Comme je chanterai avec joie mon *nunc dimittis* si cela est,' dit le Pape. Voilà, pour le moment, l'essentiel de la conversation. Le Pape a fini en disant: 'Venez demain parler au Cardinal Rampolla; il aura reçu mes instructions.' Une des premières paroles du cardinal le lendemain fut: 'Je ne vois aucun inconvénient à la démarche que veut tenter le Saint Père.' Je repris alors les idées que j'avais exposées à Léon XIII. en les expliquant, les prouvant de mon mieux. Le cardinal me dit: 'Apportez-moi ce soir un projet de lettre du Pape aux archevêques.' J'ai apporté mon projet le soir même.

Le lendemain, je n'ai vu personne, mais samedi soir j'ai vu le cardinal, qui m'a fort bien reçu. Le Pape, m'a-t-il dit en substance, croit qu'il serait mieux que ce soit moi qui écrive la

lettre. J'ai paru peu satisfait. Le cardinal m'a dit ensuite, que le Pape voulait charger l'abbé Duchesne de faire un travail sur vos ordinations.

Le lendemain matin dans une nouvelle entrevue, je déposais quelques notes chez son Eminence sur les futures conférences. En terminant j'expliquais que l'importance de la démarche était, non pas dans des entrevues à avoir tout de suite, mais dans l'engagement que des deux côtés on serait forcé de prendre tout de suite, d'avoir des conférences.

Hier au soir, dimanche, j'ai revu le cardinal. J'avais compris que la lettre qui me serait adressée serait publique ou à peu près publique. J'ai mal compris. Le cardinal me demande des explications sur ma note du matin, je lui montre que les conférences préliminaires n'auraient pas lieu avant 3 ou 4 mois, que les députés des deux côtés prendraient contact, mesureraient les difficultés qui seront très grandes, et les concessions possibles, que, par conséquent, Rome n'aurait pas à examiner les choses à fond avant 5 ou 6 mois.

Je retourne ce soir au Vatican.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

18 septembre 1894.

Notre entretien a été fort court hier avec le Cardinal. La lettre me sera adressée. J'ai demandé si l'on désirait que j'aille à Londres ; son Eminence m'a dit qu'une fois que j'aurai vu la lettre ce serait à moi de voir ce qu'il y aurait à faire. Si je vais à Londres, je vous confierai la lettre du cardinal, plus une lettre explicative de mes démarches et vous irez chez l'archevêque de Canterbury, lui porter les deux. Si, après avoir lu ces deux lettres, l'archevêque voulait me recevoir je lui dirais ce que j'ai vu et entendu ici. A York nous irions droit chez l'archevêque, il faudrait obtenir d'eux une lettre à vous adressée, pour vous remercier de la communication de la lettre de M. Dalbus et disant leurs sentiments. Vous viendriez porter cette lettre et vous obtiendriez la démarche directe de Léon XIII.

Je reçois votre lettre ; comme vous je regrette ce manque de tact chez le cardinal Vaughan.

Hier j'avais pu me rendre compte de l'ensemble du discours par les journaux, j'attendais votre appréciation avec une vive impatience.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON,

22 septembre 1894.

Les nouvelles que vous me donnez sont vraiment étonnantes. J'en reste stupéfait. On se sent si petit en face de telles choses que si ce n'était pour la conviction que c'est Dieu qui agit on aurait peur, grand peur. C'est bien vrai, que nous n'y sommes pour rien ; jamais nous n'aurions osé même songer à de telles choses. Tout ce que nous avons fait (je dis nous, mais c'est bien vous), c'est de suivre les inspirations qui nous sont venues d'en haut.

J'ai télégraphié à Addington pour savoir si l'archevêque de Canterbury est de retour chez lui : la semaine passée, il était en Cornouaille.

En venant tout droit ici, il me semble que vous pourriez (étant dans le pays) aller chez l'archevêque d'York, avant d'aller à Addington. Je crois aussi qu'il ne faut pas brusquer la visite à Addington et qu'il faut un peu préparer le terrain. D'un côté l'archevêque d'York pourrait nous donner des conseils utiles ; de l'autre, évidemment c'est à l'archevêque de Canterbury que la visite devrait être faite d'abord. En somme il me semble que si vous n'entendez rien de ma part dans un sens contraire, le mieux serait que vous vinssiez ici. Nous pourrions dans ce cas aller tout droit à l'archevêque d'York et ensuite à Addington.

Mgr. Stanley¹ est ici jusqu'à lundi matin.

Je reçois à l'instant une dépêche qui annonce que l'archevêque de Canterbury est en voyage jusqu'au 6 octobre. Evidemment il faut venir tout droit ici et voir l'archevêque d'York.

The preceding letters, which contain the account of the Abbé's interviews with Cardinal Rampolla, and of his audiences with the Pope, were very sparing in detail, from motives of discretion and also from distrust of the safety of the post, but the facts given in them are so important that it is desirable to print a translation of the Memorandum written by the Abbé at the time, which gives a connected account of what passed, and of what was said, both

¹ The Hon. Algernon Stanley, fourth son of Edward John, second Baron Stanley of Alderley, afterwards Bishop of Emmaus and coadjutor to Cardinal Vaughan.

by the Pope and Cardinal Rampolla. The Abbé's first audience lasted nearly an hour. The Pope began by saying: 'I have summoned you to Rome, and I thank you for coming so quickly. I desire to talk to you about the state of the Church of England. Sit here, and tell me what you have done.' The Abbé repeated what he had already said to Cardinal Rampolla: he spoke of his relations with me, and of our conversations, the result of which had been our resolution to attempt something for the reunion of Christendom. He explained why we had thought that the question of the validity of English Orders would be the most convenient point on which to begin. He then detailed to the Pope the various things he had seen in England, what he had been able to observe of the spirit that animated the Houses of the Sisters and religious communities, and what he had learnt of the general practice and principles of those who represented the Oxford Movement. He said he had evidently not seen the whole of the Church of England, and that he knew how much of a very different character existed within it; that there were many who sympathised much more with Protestants than with Catholics, but that the English Episcopate contained men of first-class ability, undoubted piety and great learning. He repeated his conversations with the Bishop of Peterborough and the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, indicating the differences which had marked the various conversations. He referred to what the Bishop of Peterborough had said in regard to the Papacy and to the dispositions of the Archbishop of York, whom the *Encyclical Præclara* had touched so much. He alluded to the fact that though the Archbishop of Canterbury was afraid of compromising himself, he recognised the duty of working for the cause of reunion, and had thanked the Abbé for vindicating the doctrines of the Church of England in regard to the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Pope said no one had ever talked to him about England as the Abbé had done, and he wondered whether anything, and what, could be done. It was almost the same question the Cardinal had asked the evening

before. The Abbé, who had been thinking of nothing else since he had left the Cardinal, replied :—

‘I think your Holiness might write a private letter to the two Archbishops inviting them to work with you in the interests of reunion, and proposing conferences on the question of Orders. Your Holiness would say that having addressed yourself to the Eastern Churches, you now desired to address yourself to England, but before making any public overtures to the English Church, you thought it better to address yourself privately to the two Archbishops. The letter would intimate that the question of Orders should be taken as a point of contact which would give an opportunity for the representatives on the part of Rome and of England to discuss the differences which separated them.’

‘And you believe that the Archbishops would reply to such a letter?’ said the Pope.

‘I think so,’ said the Abbé.

‘Let us consider the difficulties,’ said the Pope, ‘for there must be difficulties in the way.’

‘Yes, your Holiness, and very great difficulties, two particularly, one practical, one touching the Pope himself.’

‘As regards myself, the infallibility,’ said the Pope.

‘Yes,’ replied the Abbé, ‘but I think the infallibility could be explained in a way which might be accepted if one insisted on the means which the Pope must take to ascertain the truth.’ And the Abbé recalled his conversation with the Bishop of Peterborough.

‘But evidently,’ said the Pope, ‘the Pope must take means.’

‘Unfortunately, your Holiness, there are exaggerations, and those exaggerations do harm.’

‘And the practical difficulty,’ asked the Pope.

‘The opposition,’ replied the Abbé, ‘which some of the English Catholics would be likely to make towards any movement for corporate reunion.’¹

‘But would not the political difficulties be very great?’

¹ The truth of this statement is more than confirmed by what may be read in Cardinal Vaughan’s *Life*, and in Abbot Gasquet’s *Leaves from My Diary*.

said the Pope. 'To begin with, the dependence of the Bishops on the civil power ?'

The Abbé explained that that dependence was not as great as had been thought, and he cited the Bishop of Lincoln's refusal to appear before the Privy Council.

The Pope then thought that Crispi and the Italian Government might make difficulties, to which the Abbé said he thought the English would think very little of what Crispi or the Italian Government might say upon such a subject.

The Pope reflected for some moments, and then said decidedly : 'Yes, I will write that letter.'

There was a discussion as to where the proposed conferences should take place—Paris, Rome.

'And you really think,' the Pope said, 'that union with the Anglicans is possible ?'

'By God's grace,' the Abbé said, and then he repeated the Archbishop of York's words : 'Let us hope that we are assisting at the beginning of great things.'

'God grant it,' said the Pope, 'but I am eighty-five. How thankfully should I sing my *Nunc Dimittis* if I could do anything, even the least thing, to help forward this union.'

The next day the Abbé saw Cardinal Rampolla again, and told him of the proposition he had ventured to make. The Cardinal thought such a letter might be written. It would be a fatherly action which could only bring honour to the Holy See. There was some discussion as to conferences on the question of Orders and as to the persons who should take part in them, the Abbé remarking that those responsible for the schism in England had had no intention of separating from the Catholic Church, and that the great thing was to bring the English people back without too great a shock. To do that only the necessary changes ought to be insisted upon, and every concession possible should be made, obviously a very delicate and difficult work, but with God's help not impossible.

'Yes,' said the Cardinal, 'and for this we must pray with all our hearts that God will help us. Could you send me a

sort of sketch of the letter which should be written to the Archbishops, founded on the letter *Praeclara* to the Princes and Peoples ? ’

Two or three days later the Abbé saw the Cardinal again, who said, ‘I have seen the Pope, and I have to tell you what he has decided. The Pope thinks that the way is not sufficiently prepared for the letter you have suggested, but that some indirect opening would be better to begin with. I would write you a letter which you could give to Lord Halifax, and that letter would contain much of what you have sketched out for the letter to the Archbishops. The Abbé ventured to make certain objections : that an indirect opening might seem more prudent, but in reality it was less so, as a direct letter to the Archbishops would necessitate a reply—a letter not addressed to them obliged them to nothing—and he thought there was no doubt that a letter addressed to the Archbishops would elicit a favourable reply, but even if it were otherwise, the blame would not rest on the Pope.

The Cardinal went on to say that the Pope intended to charge the Abbé Duchesne, whose opinions on the subject were well known, to prepare a work on English Orders, the Abbé pointing out that the question of English Orders was only a means to an end, while in regard to conferences they would have the advantage of bringing both parties into contact at once.

The Pope saw the Abbé again before he left Rome, and had on his table *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*.

‘I have read your work,’ said the Pope ; ‘it is very well done. Cardinal Rampolla has given you his letter ; are you satisfied ? ’

‘Yes, Holy Father, but your Holiness knows that I should have preferred a letter direct to the Archbishops, the result would have been much more certain.’

‘That is possible, but I have seen the Principal of the Scottish Seminary, and talked to him about the Anglicans, and he tells me that the Scottish Presbyterians would be more easily reunited than the Anglicans, because they have no relation with the civil power.’

The Abbé ventured to point out why he thought the opposite. The Pope shrugged his shoulders, and said he did not know to whom to refer. He then spoke of the report of Mgr. Azarian on the proceedings of the Anglicans in Armenia,¹ which Cardinal Rampolla had forgotten to mention to the Abbé.

At the Abbé's last interview with the Cardinal, he said that if the indirect letter was replied to favourably, a direct letter would be sent to the Archbishops by the Pope.

The Abbé travelled straight back from Rome to England, and arrived at Hickleton, having travelled from Rome without stopping, on Monday, the 24th September. Mr. Courtenay and Lady Caroline Courtenay were staying with us at the time. Their whole hearts were in the cause of reunion, and I can never forget the emotion with which they listened to the Abbé's account of his audience with the Pope. As the Abbé's story proceeded it seemed to them to be the realisation and crown of the hopes cherished throughout their lives. Within hardly more than six weeks God had called them both to Himself.

Writing to Mr. Wilfrid Ward on Tuesday, 25th September, I say: 'The Abbé Portal has been to Rome, and is here. When and where could you see him?' I had to go to Leeds that afternoon to take the Chair at a meeting at which Mr. Chamberlain was to speak. I returned on the Wednesday, and on the Thursday evening, having heard that the Archbishop of York was away, the Abbé and I started for Baronsdown, near Dulverton, where I had ascertained the Archbishop of Canterbury was staying.

We arrived at Dulverton at 9 A.M. on Friday, the 28th, and at once went on to Baronsdown. The Abbé gave a full account of what had passed at Rome, and explained that the letter addressed to him by Cardinal Rampolla was an indirect step to make sure of the friendly dispositions of the heads of the English Church, and that, if the Archbishops could indirectly give him such assurance, direct overtures in the interests of reunion would be made by the Pope. It was also suggested that a letter might be written to me 'analogous to

¹ Really the American Presbyterian missionaries.

the one written to the Abbé by Cardinal Rampolla, which I might take to Rome.' The Archbishop's attitude was not encouraging. The proposal was in any case startling to one unprepared for it, and it was clear the Archbishop felt himself in a very difficult position. A direct communication from the Pope, he said, would have spoken for itself, a private, indirect communication was liable to be misinterpreted; that in his responsible position he had to guard against the possibility of misrepresentation, and the dangers which such misrepresentation might produce. He objected that the communication emanated from Cardinal Rampolla, and not from the Pope, that the change of plan at the Vatican, after the interval of a few days, threw doubts upon the Pope's intention to make any direct communication to the heads of the English Church, that the letter of Cardinal Rampolla contained expressions which an Archbishop of Canterbury could not admit—those, for example, which implied that Rome was the mother and mistress of all other Churches—that Papal infallibility was a great obstacle, but not the only one, and he alluded to the attitude of Cardinal Vaughan¹ as directly contradicting what was represented to be the friendly feeling at the Vatican.

The Abbé replied that a letter from the Secretary of State at the Vatican was equivalent to a letter from the Pope, that if the communication from Rome was indirect, it was only an indirect communication which was asked for from the Archbishop, that 'mistress' was to be explained in the sense of 'teacher,' that Rome was making proof of her good-will, and before going further expected Canterbury to do as much. The Abbé concluded by insisting on the grave responsibility incurred if such opportunity for opening relations with Rome, in the interests of peace, were neglected.

An account of what passed has also been written by Canon Mason, who was present, and appears in the second volume of the Archbishop's life.²

¹ Cardinal Vaughan's Address at Preston, on 10th September 1894, in which, amongst other things, he had suggested a doubt as to the source, whether it was from above or below, which had inspired the Catholic revival in the Anglican Church.

² See *Archbishop Benson's Life*, vol. ii. pp. 597-599.

Before leaving, I saw the Archbishop alone, and he again dwelt upon the attitude taken by Cardinal Vaughan, the impossibility of reconciling it with what the Abbé represented as the dispositions of the Pope, the grave responsibility resting on him as the head of the English Church, and the need there was of caution in a matter so open to misrepresentation as a private negotiation in such a matter, which, if misrepresented, was so likely to produce serious danger of division at home. Eventually, though his attitude was not sympathetic, the Archbishop promised to consider the matter with a view to a letter.

The attitude of reserve exhibited by the Archbishop, regrettable as it was, may seem to be justified, at least to some extent, by subsequent events. At the moment it was a profound disappointment to the Abbé Portal and myself. To me it seemed—as it still seems—the throwing away of the greatest opportunity a man ever had, and quite inconsistent with the duty of one claiming to be the successor of St. Augustine.

We left Baronsdown the same afternoon, and got back to Hickleton at 4 A.M. on Saturday. Directly after breakfast we left for Lincoln to see the Bishop,¹ and on Monday morning we started at 6 A.M. for York, to have breakfast with the Archbishop² at Bishopsthorpe. The Archbishop was much moved by the Abbé's communication. He was himself going to London and brought us back in his carriage to the station. The Abbé left at once for France, having had no opportunity of seeing Mr. Ward, who had been very anxious to hear his news, and had suggested a day for his going down to Eastbourne, too late, unfortunately, for the Abbé to accept, since he had to return to Cahors immediately. Writing a few days later, Mr. Ward, after asking for the Abbé's direction, told me that he had spoken strongly to the Cardinal in favour of the Abbé, and he believed with some effect. He also thought the Cardinal had an idea that the subject of Anglican Orders might be considered in Rome, as he had told him

¹ The Rt. Rev. Edward King.

² Archbishop Maclagan.

that he had been in correspondence with Cardinal Ledóchowski ¹ on the subject.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla

Septembre 1894.

L'abbé Portal m'a remis au nom de Sa Sainteté une photographie ² qui sera pour moi et pour les miens un souvenir précieux de la charité du Saint Père.

Je n'ai pas besoin de dire à Votre Eminence combien j'ai été confus d'une attention que je suis si loin de mériter, et dont je me sens si peu digne. J'ose prier Votre Eminence de faire parvenir à Sa Sainteté mes plus humbles et mes plus vifs remerciements.

Avec ce témoignage tout particulier de la bonté du Saint Père, l'abbé Portal m'a raconté des choses encore plus précieuses, parce qu'elles se rattachent au bien général de l'Eglise. Les grands sentiments de charité qui animent le Saint Père donnent l'espérance que l'union de l'Eglise si désirée par tant de cœurs en Angleterre se fera un jour ; et tout me fait croire que des démarches si visiblement inspirées par Notre Seigneur aboutiront à d'heureux résultats.

L'abbé Portal rentre en France. Il écrira à Votre Eminence ce que nous avons pu faire ensemble pendant ces quelques jours.

Pour moi, dès que mes engagements me le permettront, je m'empresserai d'apporter à Sa Sainteté, avec tous mes sentiments de gratitude et de respect, les résultats des démarches que nous avons commencées, et que je vais continuer avec l'aide de plusieurs personnes entièrement dévouées à Notre Seigneur, et à l'œuvre de l'Union.

¹ I am unable to reconcile this statement with that in the Abbot Gasquet's *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 3:—'Dec. 7, 1894.—I had an interview with Cardinal Vaughan this morning, in the course of which I told him what I had heard in Rome, and also what I understood from the papers shown me in England was going on in regard to reunion, and of the desire of our Anglican friends to reopen the question of their Orders. The Cardinal had heard nothing whatever on either point, and expressed his disbelief in what I had told him, as he was sure he must have had some indication of so important a matter as the question of Anglican Orders being raised in Rome.'

² A large photograph of the Pope, with an inscription under it in his own handwriting, and signed by his name.

CHAPTER VI

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK—CARDINAL VAUGHAN'S LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF TOLEDO—DRAFT OF LETTER WHICH IT WAS SUGGESTED THE POPE MIGHT WRITE TO THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK—MR. ATHELSTAN RILEY'S INTERVIEW WITH CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

THE position of affairs then in October 1894 was shortly this : Mr. Lacey and Mr. Denny, who had been engaged in the preparation of a dissertation entitled *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, were completing their work ; I was waiting for the letter I was hoping to receive from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and had, in conjunction with the Abbé Portal, drawn up a short memorandum to place on record what had occurred ; the Abbé Portal was expecting to hear from me as to the result of our interview with the Archbishop at Baronsdown ; Cardinal Vaughan and others, in opposition to all that the Abbé Portal and I were attempting, were attacking the Church of England in the Press, declaring that the Orders conferred by the Church of England were invalid, and making no concealment of the irritation they felt at the Abbé's pamphlet, his visit to England, and the line that was being taken in France and elsewhere in regard to reunion. The correspondence which ensues gives the details.

Mr. Lathbury, the editor of the (London) *Guardian*, to whom I had in confidence sent a memorandum of what had occurred, asking him to take such an attitude in the *Guardian* as would encourage friendly relations, wrote as follows :—

D. C. Lathbury, Esq., to Lord Halifax

9th Octbr. 1894.

Your Memorandum almost took my breath away. I had no notion that the Pope had such excellent dispositions. Unfortun-

ately our English Roman Catholics are a great obstacle—witness Cardinal Vaughan and ‘Historical Research’ in to-day’s *Times*,¹ and our people, who are greatly ignorant in all matters connected with Rome, naturally judge the Pope by his representatives here. Nothing would so prepare the way for the conferences the Abbé Portal desires as the suspension of the active assaults on the Church of England which have lately been carried on in so many provincial papers.

But I will do all I can.

The Rev. T. A. Lacey to Lord Halifax

MADINGLEY VICARAGE,
CAMBRIDGE, October 12, 1894.

I wrote the last sentence of the *De Hierarchia* yesterday morning, having been working almost day and night for the last week to finish it.

I have largely added to the chapter on the *praxis* of the Roman Church, taking the hint from Duchesne in *Le Bulletin Critique*, and showing historically that it arises out of misconceptions and legends, and also out of the bitterness of controversy that raged in the sixteenth century, in respect of which I do not spare our own people. I have worked into the chapter *de Sacerdotio* my old dissertation on the meaning of Transubstantiation as condemned in the Thirty-nine Articles,² of which I spoke to you once last summer.

¹ A letter from Cardinal Vaughan, and a letter signed ‘Historical Research,’ in the *Times* of 9th October, which stated categorically that ‘Cardinal Pole declared Anglican Orders conferred under the Edwardine Ordinal to be completely invalid,’ that he had ‘expelled the Anglican prelates and ministers,’ that his action had ‘been confirmed by the Pope,’ . . . that ‘the Greek and Orthodox Churches rejected Anglican Orders,’ and ‘did not recognise the English Church to be a Church at all.’

² Mr. Lacey has furnished me with the following explanation of this allusion. The point was that when Nominalism became dominant in the schools, from Ockham to Gabriel Biel, the meaning of *transubstantiation* varied from what it had been for the Realists of the twelfth century, and for St. Thomas and his followers in the thirteenth century. For Nominalists, *substance* included the element of *thisness* (*hæccitas*); therefore, if the substance of the bread was changed, its *thisness* passed away; consequently the *hoc* of which *Corpus Meum* was predicated ceased to be real. Therefore there was no real *signum* in the Sacrament, and the ‘nature of a sacrament’ was overthrown. The crucial question of controversy was about *desinitio panis*. If the substance of bread passed away, there was no *this*, and consequently no sacrament. That was Ridley’s position, and that was the ground of his condemnation. The difficulty became even greater in the seventeenth century, when the doctrine of transubstantiation was interpreted, as by some French theologians, in accordance with

I was most interested in the Memorandum¹ which E. G. Wood [Vicar of St. Clement's, Cambridge] showed me last Monday. Such a *démarche*—I can't find an English word—has no parallel, at all events since the mission of Panzani and F. Leander in 1636, nor was there anything like as much benevolence then as there seems to be now. One must only not expect too much in the way of immediate results. They will probably enough be nil; but whatever action is taken will remain on record, and will bear fruit in the future. What I most fear is lack of nerve on the part of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of York will not be deficient. With moderate expectations, the more we hope for the better. God may have more in store for us than we think likely.

the Cartesian category of substance. It has disappeared with the emphatic teaching of Franzelin and his followers about the *objective reality of the species*. Whatever may be thought of their metaphysics, they do re-establish, at all events in definition, the nature of a sacrament.

The following passages from the letter of an English Roman Catholic theologian illustrate the point referred to:—

'On the authority of St. Thomas (*Sum. Th.* iii. Q. 2, Art. 6, ad. 3; cf. Arnold and Scannell's *Catholic Dictionary* (second edition), p. 315), "substance" may be taken as the equivalent of "essentia," or "nature." If this be allowed, it seems to me that the main objection to the Tridentine phraseology of "substance"—that it implied the full-blown Scholastic philosophy of reality—falls to the ground. If "substance" mean no more than the "nature" of a thing (that which makes bread to be bread and not a body or a stone) then when the "substance" of a thing is changed, the change is purely metaphysical, being concerned with the thing's "quiddity." I should have thought that Manning would be a sufficient authority, and his words (*Purcell, Life*, ii. p. 31) are plain: "There are many philosophies about 'matter,' 'substance,' etc., but none are authoritative. There are many because no *one* has been defined."

'I think that Kant's notion of "substance" as a "category" untouched by sensuous experience, an innate endowment of the mind, and virtually incognisable, affords a bridge that may unite hostile views of transubstantiation. If "substance" be a reality beyond the vain shadows of a phenomenal world, unconditioned by sensuous experience, moving in a sphere altogether outside the range of mental activity; if, in Kant's own words, "the conception of a thing which can exist *per se* only as a subject . . . possesses no objective reality, that is to say, we can never know whether there exists an object to correspond to the conception," (*Critique of Pure Reason*, Meiklejohn's trans., p. 244); then, I think there is very small difference between the view of transubstantiation that I have been maintaining—a view that contents itself with affirming the truth of Christ's words, while refusing more than a metaphysical entity incognisable by experience—and the Anglican doctrine backed by the philosophy of Kant on "substance" as a noumenon to which the mind can never penetrate.'

¹ The Memorandum, previously mentioned, sent to Mr. Lathbury. Mr. Lacey was then living near Cambridge, and, like myself, in close communication with Mr. Wood in regard to the whole subject.

Dating from Cahors on the 13th October, the Abbé Portal said :—

Il me tarde, comme bien vous pensez, d'avoir de vos nouvelles et de savoir où vous en êtes. Je vous accompagne, dans toutes vos démarches de mes vœux les plus ardents et de mes pauvres prières. Beaucoup d'autres prient pour le succès de l'œuvre. Hier notre Supérieur général m'écrivait : ' Je ne veux pas tarder à vous remercier et à vous féliciter. Vraiment votre zèle a été déjà bien récompensé et j'espère que Dieu couronnera l'œuvre dont il s'agit d'un plein succès. Je prie pour cela et fais prier nos sœurs d'Angleterre.' Toutes ces prières doivent nous donner confiance ; elles nous obtiendront la grâce, malgré notre indignité, de travailler à l'œuvre de Dieu ; elles obtiendront que l'œuvre se fasse par nous ou par de plus dignes.

Still, not hearing from the Archbishop, I wrote to him on the 18th of October, my letter crossing one from him on the 15th (see p. 137), begging very earnestly for such an acknowledgment of Cardinal Rampolla's letter as we desired to obtain, enclosing a memorandum of what had occurred up to that time, together with the draft of such a letter as I believed the Pope might write without provoking the dangers the Archbishop feared.

Lord Halifax to the Archbishop of Canterbury

HICKLETON,
October 18, 1894.

I enclose a Memorandum ¹ in French drawn up by the Abbé Portal and myself, which gives a summary of what has passed. Your Grace will see on reading it over, how very important it all is.

I cannot doubt, all the circumstances are so remarkable, and have come so entirely of themselves—that is, not of our provoking—that they are God's doing.

Humanly speaking, it seems impossible to see how peace is to come—but it is well to hope, and to hope largely.

It is enough to take one step at a time, and so long as that step seems right in itself, I do not think we need trouble ourselves about the next. That we may leave to God, who has guided us so far, and, if it be His work, will guide us in the future.

¹ See Memorandum, p. 132.

Meanwhile, will your Grace, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York, write me such a private letter as I can take to Rome? Your Grace may trust me—I know all the difficulties, and would say and do nothing which could, if it were to be made public to-morrow, compromise any one but myself.

What I want is a letter which should speak generally of peace and union—which should point out that whatever mistakes have been made in England, and whatever we may have to reproach ourselves with—we have honestly desired at least to adhere to the '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*'; that none can be more sensible than we are of the miseries of disunion, and the infinite injury that they do to the cause of truth in face of the infidelities of the present time; that apart from the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, we see no hope of solving all the social questions which are everywhere raising their heads; that the Pope's recent Encyclical urging to unity has all our warmest sympathies; that we must rejoice that he who is by universal consent the Primate of Christendom should have taken so great a matter in hand, and that there are no sacrifices we are not ready to make—and no labours we are not prepared to undertake—for so blessed an end as the reunion of Christendom, on the basis of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints, etc.

Your Grace will see the sort of thing that seems to be wanted. Such a letter to me would, I believe, elicit the '*démarche directe*' from Rome, of which the Pope and Cardinal Rampolla have spoken.

That '*démarche*' must be open and public. It is impossible to have any private arrangement; such would only increase the difficulties in the way of doing anything. But I believe that if the Pope would write to your Grace such a public letter as the one I have sketched out,¹ and which I enclose, there would be no difficulties at all, and that every one in England, Nonconformists and all, would be thankful and grateful that it had pleased God to put it into Leo XIII.'s heart to write such a letter, and thus to pave the way for the reconciliation of those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

I entreat your Grace to think much of this. It is a great opportunity.

Dante assigns the lowest place to those who, having a great opportunity, refuse to take it. It is the highest ideals that

¹ See draft of letter, p. 135.

really influence the world ; and I am satisfied that nothing could be so blessed in the interests of the Church at large, and in the interests of the Church of England in particular, as to carry through what I am sketching out for your Grace's consideration.

England cannot afford to stand alone in her present isolation.

If our bishops have their rights, so have the rest of the bishops of the Catholic Church. We are bound, in view of our past history, to make good our position in the eyes of the world—and if anything were needed to show how useful such a step would be to us all, all this recent correspondence in the *Times* upon Anglican Orders is enough to show it.

My dear Lord, forgive me for writing as I do ; no one can be more conscious than I am of the amazing liberty I am taking ; but the circumstances are so extraordinary that I cannot help it.

My whole heart is here, and I write as the thoughts come.

I should have written before, but Lord Grey's¹ illness and death have prevented my doing so.

The Abbé Portal was astonished at his audacity in talking so freely to the Pope. I am amazed at myself in writing as I have to the 'Alterius orbis Papa.'

Memorandum enclosed, together with sketch of such a letter as I suggested the Pope might write :—

En parlant avec l'abbé Portal des choses de l'église anglicane, il est arrivé que tous les deux nous avons éprouvé un grand désir de faire quelque chose pour l'union.

Nous avons cru que les Ordres offraient un excellent terrain pour aborder la question, et, c'est avec cette intention que l'abbé a fait sur les Ordinations anglicanes la brochure que l'on connaît.

Cette brochure se divisait en trois parties. La première était consacrée au rite ; la seconde, au ministre ; la troisième, au sujet. Le rite était reconnu suffisant ; pour ce qui était du ministre, le fait historique était admis ; il pouvait y avoir doute sur l'intention ; quant au sujet, on le considérait à cause de la porrection des instruments comme nul, en s'appuyant, sur la

¹ Henry, third Earl Grey. Mr. Albert Grey (the present Earl Grey) was abroad, and I had been sent for to Howick, where I had remained till after the funeral.

théorie que l'Eglise a le pouvoir de changer la forme et la matière de certains Sacrements. Ce dernier point, qui était défavorable, n'est pas d'enseignement commun actuellement parmi les théologiens romains. Par conséquent on était sûr d'avance que la partie défavorable ne serait pas acceptée. En effet, l'abbé Duchesne, dans le *Bulletin Critique* du 15 juillet, conclut que sur la démonstration de la suffisance du rite, et la certitude du fait historique, on devait conclure à la validité. Et si tous les théologiens romains n'ont pas admis les conclusions de l'abbé Duchesne, tous ont vu qu'ils connaissaient très imparfaitement la question.

A l'occasion de la brochure on a essayé de créer un mouvement de sympathie dans la presse française, et l'on est arrivé à ce résultat qu'il a paru dans *l'Univers*, le *Monde*, le *Moniteur de Rome*, la *Vérité*, les *Etudes Religieuses*, et le *Bulletin Critique*, des articles sympathiques ; et aussi des lettres d'évêques, tels que le cardinal Bourret, l'archevêque d'Albi, l'évêque de Cahors, et l'évêque de Salisbury.

Nous aurions voulu ajouter à toutes ces preuves de l'intérêt qu'inspira la cause, une lettre, soit du Pape, soit du cardinal Rampolla, et c'est pour cela que l'abbé a fait un petit rapport, qu'on a fait parvenir au cardinal Rampolla, par monsignor Bøglin, directeur du *Moniteur de Rome*, journal officiel du Vatican, qui s'est montré très sympathique ; et par M. Lorin, avec qui M. Levé, directeur du *Monde*, nous a mis en relation. Sur ces entrefaites l'abbé a été en Angleterre, où il a passé trois semaines.

A son retour en France, il a reçu communication d'une lettre adressée à M. Lorin par le cardinal Rampolla, qui témoignait le désir de voir l'abbé Portal à Rome.

Avant le départ de l'abbé pour l'Italie, nous eûmes une entrevue à Paris avec MM. Lorin, Levé, et l'abbé le 8 septembre. Le 11 septembre, l'abbé a été reçu par le cardinal, et le 12 par le Pape.

Après avoir parlé de ce qu'il avait vu en Angleterre, et de ce qu'il comprenait de l'état actuel de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, il a été amené par le Pape lui-même à dire s'il y avait quelque chose à faire en ce moment pour la cause de l'Union.

L'abbé a répondu avec la plus grande franchise, qu'il lui semblait qu'une lettre pouvait être adressée par le Pape aux archevêques de Cantorbéry et de York. Dans cette lettre le Pape dirait qu'il a appris des choses très consolantes sur l'état

de l'église anglicane, sur le désir d'Union qui existe dans beaucoup de ses membres, et qu'il s'adresse à eux pour savoir s'il y aurait quelque chose à faire pour le bien de l'Eglise, et quels moyens on pourrait prendre ; les priant de travailler ensemble à l'union des Chrétiens.

La lettre devait être secrète et privée par déférence pour les archevêques, puisqu'ainsi le Pape pouvait demander conseil. Cette démarche fut acceptée par le Pape et par le cardinal Rampolla, et il fut même question de conférences qui pourraient être le résultat d'une telle démarche, et où la question des Ordres devait nécessairement être traitée en premier lieu. Deux jours après, il a paru plus prudent au Pape et au cardinal de ne pas faire tout d'abord cette démarche directe ; mais de la faire précéder par une lettre adressée à l'abbé Portal, lui témoignant l'intérêt qu'on prenait à Rome à sa brochure et le plaisir qu'on avait à voir traiter le sujet d'une telle façon, exprimant la bonne volonté de Rome à l'égard de l'église d'Angleterre, et le désir de prendre contact par des conférences amicales.

Cette lettre devait amener de la part de l'église anglicane une démarche quelconque qui permettrait au Pape d'adresser la lettre directe aux archevêques.

Evidemment il était nécessaire qu'à Rome on eût quelque preuve d'une égale bonne volonté en Angleterre, et une assurance que la démarche du Pape ne serait pas repoussée.

Dans les dernières entrevues le cardinal Rampolla a dit que le Pape voulait charger l'abbé Duchesne de faire un travail sur les Ordres—et le cardinal Rampolla et le Pape ont tous deux dit combien il était important de résoudre d'abord cette question.

Dans sa dernière audience l'abbé Portal a vu *Les Ordinations Anglicanes* sur la table du Pape, qui lui a dit combien il était content de ce travail qu'il avait lu lui-même, et combien il avait aimé la conclusion qui pousse à l'unité par l'examen des Ordres.

Il est clair d'après tout ce qui vient d'être dit, qu'il dépend maintenant uniquement des archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York que la démarche du Pape soit faite. Pour cela il leur suffit de répondre à la démarche indirecte par une démarche analogue.

Une telle démarche de la part de Rome, le choix de l'abbé Duchesne, constituent des procédés si bienveillants pour l'église d'Angleterre, et démontrent un si grand désir d'envisager les

choses sous le point de vue le plus favorable pour cette église ; ils sont de plus si conformes aux désirs et aux espérances de tous ceux qui en Angleterre ont cherché quels seraient les meilleurs moyens pour commencer l'œuvre de l'union si ardemment désirée par tous les cœurs Chrétiens, qu'ils ne pourraient pas ne pas être accueillis par les autorités anglicanes sans que celles-ci encourussent une grande responsabilité non seulement envers l'église d'Angleterre elle-même, mais envers l'Eglise entière.

Suggested sketch of such a letter as would be welcomed by the whole of England if written by the Pope to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York :—

‘ I am a very old man, and my one desire before I die is to do something for the peace and unity of the Church. How are the social questions which are everywhere raising their heads to be solved, how is the rising tide of infidelity and misbelief to be met, if the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ are disunited, and at war among themselves ?

‘ I have heard many consoling things about religion in England, of the renewal of life and energy and of the spiritual devotion which are manifesting themselves in the Anglican Communion.

‘ I have been told also how the bishops in communion with the See of Canterbury are to meet at Lambeth in two years’ time to celebrate the thirteen-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of St. Augustine in England, the founder of the See of Canterbury, and the preacher of the Gospel to your Saxon forefathers.

‘ I do not indeed forget the ancient British Church whose bishops were among those at the Council of Arles—or later the missionary efforts of such as St. Columba and St. Aidan, but St. Augustine is the Apostle of England, and it was to one of my predecessors, St. Gregory the Great, that his mission to England was due.

‘ Following in his steps, I desire also to send a message to England—a message of peace and reconciliation. I pray you to receive it as those who desire nothing so much as the restoration of visible communion amongst all those who call on the Name of Christ our God. I entreat you to labour with me to bring about that blessed and happy result.

‘ I might, had I been younger, have delayed addressing you

till the time when the meeting of the bishops was actually taking place, but my years are so many, and my life is so uncertain, that it is probable before that time has come, I may have gone to my account.

‘Let me then antedate the time of my communication. Let me ask you, for the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, who prayed that His people might be one, to place this letter before the bishops of the Anglican Communion when they are assembled at Canterbury, to entreat them to labour for the peace of the Church and to consider with you what steps they can take to hasten that end. With what joy shall I welcome such efforts, and co-operate with them should I be still alive, and if my work here be ended, and it should please God to grant me knowledge of such efforts, what a joy will it be to me to know that my last work on earth was for the peace and reunion of Christendom.

‘Meanwhile, and as a preliminary to that peace, which can only come through the truth and by a recognition of that Catholic faith of which the bishops of the whole Church in union with the Primate of Christendom are the guardians, I would ask you to appoint learned men to confer with others appointed by myself, for the purpose of establishing the validity of the Orders conferred by the Anglican Church, the acknowledgment of which, if it can be made good on principles recognised by the whole Church, East and West alike—a question quite independent of the rights justly belonging to the Roman Church—I shall welcome with joy, as a step towards that reunion for which I so earnestly long. For this purpose, and as a proof how anxious I am that the results of such an investigation should be favourable to the Anglican Communion, I am ready to nominate, amongst others, the Abbé Duchesne, whose sentiments are already known to be favourable to the claims of the Anglican Communion, to confer with delegates appointed by yourselves.

‘I beg you to help me in this, and to take this first step towards peace.

‘The sixteenth century was one of disunion. May it please God to grant to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the privilege of bringing peace and reconciliation, and the glory of restoring the old waste places and rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem.’

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Halifax*¹

ADDINGTON PARK,
CROYDON, 15 October 1894.

I need scarcely say how much thought I have given to your late visit to me at Baronsdown. I need not assure you that I can conceive of no greater privilege or happiness than to be used by our Lord as an instrument in realising that unity which He treats as the consummation of His Gospel. I am sure that you hold that there could be no unity except on the basis of Truth, and that you would be first to impress on me that this responsible position of mine binds me above all not to risk Truth for the sake of any policy of unity.

If I had known, when you asked for that interview, that M. Portal would accompany you, I would have pointed out that my position almost required that I should be informed beforehand of any very grave matter which he had to lay before me; and I will ask you now kindly to excuse anything that could possibly seem harsh, by remembering that my interview with him was a great surprise. The sum of what then passed was this: M. Portal gave me a copy of a letter from Cardinal Rampolla to himself, based on the representations which M. Portal had made to his Eminence of the state of religion in England. The letter breathes a spirit of charity and strong desire for unity, but is written in very general terms, which do not commit its author to any definite statement; but he apparently regards with satisfaction the arguments with which M. Dalbus (and M. Duchesne) combat the unfounded difficulties raised by ordinary Roman Catholics as to the validity of English Orders. M. Portal added that he knew from the very highest authority that M. Duchesne (whose views are known) is to be entrusted with the production of full researches upon the question. He (M. Portal) had himself had personal experience of the amicable views of this authority.

It is important to observe that M. Portal desired that this communication should be private, but he wished me to express in writing a favourable reception of it.

I must first say, as I said then, that the Archbishop of Canterbury is not in a position to take a private and unofficial line with secret agents from great powers. It is not our English method of procedure. It is not possible for me to say more upon that

¹ Received, as stated, after my letter of 18th October (p. 130).

letter than that I also most deeply desire and pray that all the dissensions of Christendom might be ended, and rejoice that others long for it. But among its kindly lines that letter contains expressions totally inadmissible and inconsistent with the primitive model to which England appeals.

But what is most important is that at this very time (before and since that interview) the head and representative of the Roman Catholic Church in England is officially declaring in a series of public utterances the absolute and uncompromising repudiation by the Papal See of the Orders of the Anglican Church.

How is it possible to weigh the private conversation of a private person on the private sentiments of a great power against the open declarations of the one most dignified and accredited agent of the same power? Whatever you may believe as to those private views, you could not wish me to ignore the fact that Cardinal Vaughan has spoken with an authority that nothing but public authority can contradict.

I shall await with the utmost interest the result of M. Duchesne's research, and also its reception by the Pope. It is impossible that any step could be taken whilst the validity of our English Orders remained unacknowledged. And I shall then venture to hope that further investigations may be deemed not impossible on the part of the Roman Catholic Church into that doctrine and practice of the primitive Church to which the English Church appeals.

Meantime the spirit of Love, which Cardinal Rampolla also invokes, is the best preparation for fruitful investigation. '*Pectus facit theologum*,' and no one will rejoice more than I if theology working in that spirit leads Christians to perfect Unity in the Truth.

Lord Halifax to the Archbishop of Canterbury

BOSAHAN, R.S.O., ST. MARTIN,
CORNWALL, October 22, 1894.

Time to consider your Grace's letter does not diminish the distress I feel at having seemed to have treated your Grace without due consideration.

Nothing indeed could be further from my thoughts and intentions. But your Grace cannot really think that I had any idea I was putting your Grace in a difficulty by acting as I did. The Abbé Portal was no secret and unofficial agent. He was

merely one earnestly desirous of promoting the unity of the Church, who was convinced that a great step might be taken in that direction at the present moment, who knew that great ignorance as to the position and principles of the Church of England prevailed abroad and saw that it was of the first importance that ignorance should be dispelled. Moreover, he was in possession of facts which led him to believe that the communication to your Grace of Cardinal Rampolla's letter to him would give your Grace an opportunity of saying something in a letter to me which might lead to very great results, in the direction of preparing the way for peace and reunion. Knowing all this, was it unnatural that I should at once have thought of bringing the Abbé to see your Grace? I was anxious that the things I had to report to your Grace should be confirmed at first hand. I thought your Grace, after what had passed at Addington, would like to see the Abbé. I knew he was implicitly to be trusted. I felt your Grace could hardly fail to be moved by what he had to say, and I did not see that anything your Grace could say to me in consequence could in any way be a difficulty to your Grace or to any one else.

Turning away from mere personal matters, may I say this : the attitude of Cardinal Vaughan, which, however, I think is not quite understood, and certainly the attitude of many of the English Roman Catholics who have recently been writing on this subject, is sufficient of itself to prove how greatly they would dislike any such outcome of the present situation as I still venture to think it is in your Grace's power to secure, and how completely the action of Leo XIII., which would result from a sympathetic letter from your Grace to myself such as I have ventured to ask for, would cut the ground from under their feet.

It surely is not just to make Leo XIII. responsible for the utterances of Cardinal Vaughan, any more than it would be just to make your Grace responsible for the utterances we have from time to time heard from the Bishop of Worcester,¹ the Bishop of Liverpool,² Archdeacon Farrar³ and others.

I cannot help thinking that your Grace's letter has been written under some misapprehension. It is not as if there were no difficulties attaching to our own position.

¹ Rt. Rev. John James Stewart Perowne, D.D.

² Rt. Rev. John Charles Ryle, D.D.

³ The Ven. Frederic William Farrar, Archdeacon of Westminster.

Can we deny that there is much which must seem hard to reconcile with Catholic doctrine and practice in the circumstances of the Anglican Communion as it must appear in the eyes of even well-informed foreigners? What are we to say of our lack of authority and discipline, to mention only one point which must strike every one who is acquainted with our condition?

Is this not just the occasion for bringing about what is the most effective answer to Cardinal Vaughan? I am sure if your Grace will only consider such an article as that in the *Times* of Saturday ¹ [20th October] in regard to our Orders, it will be seen how our whole position is given away. What an impression such writing must produce, not only on those outside the Anglican Communion, but even on our own people. Can we afford to stand off, is it even just to others, much less to ourselves, not to afford such help as is in our power to bring about a truer view of our position?

What inducements has Rome to acknowledge our Orders, if we refuse any overture and stand aloof, saying, we will do nothing to help to put matters straight between us, at least on this point? I feel sure the fault must be mine in not having made this clear, and in having thus given your Grace a wrong impression. It seems to me, if I may be so bold as to say so, that your Grace's letter as it stands could only have the effect of closing the door to much that might have been productive of consequences inspiring the brightest hopes, and that if it could be modified in certain particulars—a modification which, if I had more clearly expressed myself, would have been unnecessary, as your Grace's letter would then have been very different—it might still, without incurring any sort of risks—risks which I should be as sensitive about as any one—be productive of incalculable good. Would it be possible for your Grace to confer with the Archbishop of York on the subject, who also saw the Abbé Portal after he returned to England from Italy?

Two or three days later I heard from the Archbishop of York, who said :—

I was at Addington the night before last, and spent a very long time with the Archbishop talking over your proposals. I

¹ The effect of the article was indirectly, though not the less effectively, to support Cardinal Vaughan's statements; its object could hardly be mistaken.

went so far as to draft a letter which might be addressed to you, and I have left it with him for his consideration.

His chief difficulty is Cardinal Vaughan, and there is a great deal of reason in what the Archbishop says—that while the acknowledgment of our Orders, and the kindly expressions connected with this, come from irresponsible members of the Gallican Church, Cardinal Vaughan, who is the authorised representative of the Roman Church, denies altogether, with bitterness and insolence, that we have any Holy Orders at all. The Pope, of course, knows all that Vaughan is saying, and does not restrain him. This is certainly a very grave difficulty.

In consequence of my representations, and as the result of his interview with the Archbishop of York, the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote me on October 27th an alternative letter to that which he had written on 15th October. The letter was as follows :—

I have been much interested in all that you have brought to my knowledge as to recent indications of a more friendly feeling towards the Church of England on the part of certain persons of influence in the Church of Rome.

The Church of England must always be desirous to stand in amicable relation to all other branches of the Catholic Church, so long as this can be done without any sacrifice on her part of Scriptural truth, or of the great principles for which she has contended in making her appeal to primitive antiquity—to the ‘*quod semper*’ as well as the ‘*quod ubique et ab omnibus*.’ It is her daily prayer that ‘all who profess and call themselves Christians should be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life,” and she will always welcome every hope of a better understanding between those who are in any way estranged or separated from one another within the fold of the Church of Christ.

In our great and unceasing conflict with the powers of evil, it could not fail to be an unspeakable gain to the cause of Christ, and we may reverently believe a source of joy to the Head, our Blessed Lord Himself, if all the branches of His Church, although separated from one another through diversities of national character and history, or even through the frailty of our human nature, should stand side by side, striving with

one spirit, if not always with one mind, for the faith of the Gospel, upon the basis of one Evangelical truth and Apostolical order.

I was not, however, satisfied, and I was bold enough to suggest to the Archbishop the possibility of combining both letters, with certain additions and omissions. Some unimportant correspondence ensued, and about the middle of November I went down to Addington to see the Archbishop on the subject. The Archbishop of York, who was at Addington towards the end of the month, also mentioned, and I believe supported, my proposal of an amended letter. The Archbishop took some time to consider the matter, but eventually, in a letter ¹ dated 14th December, declined to adopt my suggestion. I had in consequence to fall back upon the letter of 15th October, already given.

This, however, is somewhat to anticipate the course of events. Writing on the subject at the end of October, Mr. Lathbury, the editor of the *Guardian*, who was deeply interested in the cause of reunion, says :—

I am sorry, though not surprised, at your news of the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, that it was to be expected does not make it less melancholy. It will be a wonderful opportunity thrown away. Is it quite impossible to keep the thing simmering some time longer, at all events till you have been to Rome? I am afraid no advance towards reunion will be made till the Church is disestablished. The weight of the laity, and the anxiety of the bishops not to be ‘party men,’ will always stand in the way. But we can only ‘labour for peace,’ though the Archbishop and the Cardinal ‘make them ready to battle.’

Writing to Mr. Wilfrid Ward about the same time, I told him that the Abbé Portal had seen the Pope; that it only depended upon the Archbishops of Canterbury and York whether he should make a direct step towards England, and that I was expecting a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to enable me to act. I also added that no one could be more alive than I was to the absolute necessity of Rome understanding how serious the lodgment was

¹ See Archbishop Benson’s *Life*, vol. ii. p. 611.

which Protestantism had effected within the Anglican Communion, and I promised to send him a memorandum on the whole subject, which, however, I said, was only for himself, at all events until we had been able to talk the matters over.

Mr. Ward, in a reply dated the 23rd October, said :—

I am very glad you agree as to the importance of Rome's understanding fully the power of the Protestant party in the Anglican Church. I suppose the English Church Union only includes a comparatively small fraction of the clergy, say, one-sixth. I have written to the Abbé urging on him that this should be understood in Rome. I don't think good would be done to any one by Rome taking any step based simply on a misconception of the facts. I shall be very much interested to know what the Pope contemplates, and what the Archbishop of Canterbury agrees to.

Cardinal Vaughan meanwhile had been as ready to act and as determined to employ every means in his power to defeat what the Abbé Portal and I were attempting, as the Archbishop of Canterbury had been dilatory.

The following letter to the Abbé Portal, informing him of what was happening in regard to the Archbishop's letter, written after I had become acquainted with Cardinal Vaughan's action, gives an account of what had occurred :—

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

29 octobre 1894.

La lettre que j'ai reçue de l'archevêque il y a dix jours ne me plaît pas. En effet elle n'est pas ce que nous aurions voulu. Certaines choses qui auraient dû y être, n'y sont pas, et d'autres, qu'il aurait été beaucoup mieux, pour dire le moins, ne pas dire, s'y trouvent ; mais réflexion faite, et en la relisant, j'ai trouvé que j'avais peut-être exagéré la mauvaise impression qu'elle m'avait donnée, et que si l'archevêque voulait supprimer quelques phrases, et en ajouter quelques autres, elle suffirait. Vous comprenez que j'aurais voulu une lettre différente, mais si cela était impossible, vu la position prise par le cardinal Vaughan sur laquelle l'archevêque s'appuyait, et qui produit sur lui la plus mauvaise impression, avec ces modifications,

elle exprimait l'essentiel. Entre autres choses l'archevêque disait qu'il était impossible de souhaiter un plus grand bonheur que d'être un instrument dans les mains de Notre Seigneur pour aider la cause de l'union des Eglises. Pour obtenir ces modifications, j'ai écrit longuement à l'archevêque d'York, lui disant avec la plus grande franchise toute ma pensée, atténuant de mon mieux toutes les paroles du cardinal, insistant sur ce qu'à Rome on n'était pas responsable pour l'attitude prise par lui, et je le priais de faire tout son possible pour obtenir une lettre telle que nous la désirions, ou au moins des modifications à la lettre actuelle de l'archevêque de Canterbury. L'archevêque d'York a vu l'archevêque de Canterbury. On a beaucoup parlé de ce qu'on devait faire et il a même fait un projet de lettre qu'il a laissé à l'archevêque. Il m'écrit que cette lettre est maintenant sous la considération de l'archevêque de Canterbury, mais que la grande difficulté est le cardinal Vaughan, qui à ce moment même, comme vous avez vu d'après les lettres que je vous ai envoyées, choisit l'occasion de nier absolument la validité de nos Ordres, de faire tout ce qu'il peut pour entraver tous les bons procédés qui se sont produits à notre égard en France, et, à ce qu'on croirait, pour empêcher toute considération amicale de la question traitée dans votre brochure. L'archevêque de Canterbury dit, et avec quelque raison, qu'après tout le cardinal Vaughan représente le Pape en Angleterre et qu'on le laisse agir.

Voilà en résumé ce que m'écrit l'archevêque d'York après sa visite à Addington.

La lettre de l'archevêque d'York m'est arrivée il y a deux jours, aussi bien qu'un petit mot amical, pour moi personnelle-ment, de la part de l'archevêque de Canterbury lui-même. Tout ceci encourageait l'espoir que j'allais obtenir la lettre voulue quand dans le *Times* de vendredi [26th Oct.] paraît une lettre que voici du cardinal Vaughan à l'archevêque de Tolède, suivie le lendemain (samedi) d'une lettre du cardinal au Directeur du *Times*, que je vous envoie aussi.

D'après la lettre du cardinal au rédacteur du *Times*, on voit très bien (1) que le cardinal ne prévoyait pas la publication de sa lettre à l'archevêque de Tolède, (2) que la traduction de cette lettre, bien qu'elle ne donne pas le sens exact du latin, donne très bien l'impression que la lettre devait produire, (3) que cette impression, en tant qu'elle qualifiait ma conduite d'astuce et de subtilité, était fausse, vu que les termes de ma lettre à l'archevêque de Tolède et les signatures qui l'accompagnaient,

empêchaient toute possibilité de tromperie, (4) que le cardinal lui-même comprend très bien combien une lettre pareille était peu digne de lui.

Il est encore aussi clair que le jour, que le cardinal n'a pas regardé de trop près aux moyens dont il se servait pour nous faire une mauvaise partie.

En vérité, mon cher ami, une très petite dose de charité aurait vu autre chose dans ma lettre à l'archevêque de Tolède que ce que le cardinal y a trouvé.

Ce qui est évident, c'est que pour le moment je suis dans une position très difficile, et que l'espoir d'obtenir les modifications désirées dans la lettre de l'archevêque est beaucoup amoindri. L'archevêque de Canterbury avait plus raison que je ne le croyais.

The action of Cardinal Vaughan, referred to in the foregoing letter, was consequent upon an address to the Archbishop of Toledo, which I had written, on behalf of the English Church Union,¹ in the following terms :—

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION,
35 WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND, LONDON,
October 8th, 1894.

To the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Lora Antolino Monescillo, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Toledo.

I venture to approach your Eminence in order to express, on behalf of the English Church Union, a Society consisting of many thousands of members of the Church of England, the profound distress which has been caused to us by the recent action of the Archbishop of Dublin in having presumed, without the sanction of your Eminence and of the Bishops of your province of Toledo, to consecrate a certain schismatic named Cabrera, at Madrid, to the Episcopate. We desire absolutely to disclaim any complicity with such action, believing it to be a most grievous violation of well-established and universally recognised principles of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and of Catholic order. We are also apprehensive lest it might be supposed by any members of the illustrious Church of Spain that the ancient Church of England, of whose honour we, as her loyal members, are most dutifully jealous, is in any way responsible for this action, which we so earnestly deplore. We therefore would say—First, that

¹ See letter to Dean Lake, p. 85.

the Provinces of Canterbury and York, which constitute the Church of England, are ecclesiastically independent of, and can in no way control, those which constitute the Church of Ireland. Secondly, that in the last session of the Provincial Synod of Canterbury, held in the present year, the Primate of All England and the bishops of his province repudiated all responsibility for the step contemplated by the Archbishop of Dublin. The Church of England has thus entirely disclaimed responsibility for an act which is, and remains, simply the private act of the Archbishop of Dublin and the two Irish bishops who assisted him. Nevertheless, we on our behalf believe it to be right as members of the Catholic Church, which is the mother of us all, and as members of the Church of England in particular, thus solemnly to assure your Eminence and the bishops, clergy, and faithful of the ancient and illustrious Church of Spain of our repudiation of the encouragement which the action we deplore has given to those who have withdrawn themselves from the communion and authority of their lawful pastors.

The text of this address having been published, Cardinal Vaughan wrote a letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, in Latin, the following translation of which appeared in the *Times* of October 26th—

The considerations which I am about briefly and promptly to place before your Eminence, upon a matter of the greatest urgency (as may be gathered from the context), will explain the reason for my sending to you the telegram of this day's date.

The English newspapers have just published a letter by Lord Halifax with regard to the consecration of Señor Cabrera.

(1) This noblemen is not, and never was, a Catholic, but the chief of one of the sects of the Anglican Church, which claims for itself, without the smallest foundation, the name of the true Catholic Church.

(2) In taking such a name this sect has acted with a view to be regarded in Catholic countries as the National Catholic English Church.

(3) It is extremely important that your Eminence should be possessed of those facts, in order that you may treat Lord Halifax and the sect over which he presides with prudence, not dealing with it as if it were a member or part of the Catholic Church, but as a member or part of the Anglican Protestant Church, subject to the civil power.

(4) The Viscount's letter is written with the object of astutely deceiving the Catholic bishops who may not be as well informed as your Eminence.

(5) Many persons of this sect, when travelling in Catholic countries, are accustomed audaciously and sacrilegiously to communicate in the Catholic churches.

(6) This sect speaks of us English Catholics as schismatics, and the Catholic Church in England as an Italian Mission.

With regard to Señor Cabrera, who has received the Episcopal pseudo-consecration, I have to call the attention of your Eminence to the following :—

The bishops and clergy of the English and Irish Protestant Church do not possess valid Orders. The formula of ordination composed by Cranmer, in the time of the Reformation, was made with the object of excluding all notion of that sacerdotal power (*sacerdotium*) which pertains to ministers who offer sacrifice.

On this point I transmit herewith to your Eminence a letter which I have published in the English newspapers, in which I expose briefly the reasons which exist for not being able to recognise the validity of the Orders of the Anglican Church.

With regard to the manner in which the pseudo-consecration of Señor Cabrera should be treated, whether by your Eminence or by any one else who may concern himself about the matter, it would be convenient not to insist solely upon the sacrilege that has been committed, but more especially upon the fact that the validity of the Orders of the Anglican Church has never been recognised by the Holy See, nor by the Catholic world, and that as regards true Orders, understood in a Catholic sense, neither the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin nor the bishops and clergy of the Protestant Church, whether Anglican or Irish, should be considered more than as so many laymen.

With the object of defending the truth, I write this letter to your Eminence.

On the following day appeared a letter from Cardinal Vaughan in explanation :—

I see in a letter of mine to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, of which you have to-day published a translation, that one of my points is incorrectly rendered. I did not intend to say, nor did I say, that Lord Halifax wrote 'with the object of astutely deceiving the Catholic bishops.' I know that Lord Halifax is simply incapable of writing with the object of deceiving any one.

Point (4) was the following: 'Epistola praedicti Vicecomitis ita scripta est, ut episcopum, qui astutiam subtilem hujus sectae non cognosceret, sicut eam cognoscit Eminentia Vestra, facile decipere posset.'

My meaning, though not fully expressed in the above point, was that a letter emanating from a body which is able by subtle arguments to convince itself that it represents the Catholic Church in this country, while it regards us as schismatics and intruders, might easily deceive a bishop in Spain unacquainted with such subtleties.

The letter was not intended for publication; and I regret that what was intended only as brief notes of information upon a matter of grave importance should have been published in a form likely to give unnecessary pain and offence.

The Cardinal's explanation of the paragraph in his letter touching myself, though it might explain what he had intended to say, left what he had actually said where it was: 'This nobleman is the chief of one of the sects of the Anglican Church,' etc. 'It is extremely important that you should be possessed of these facts in order that you may treat Lord Halifax and the sect over which he presides with prudence,' etc. And, point (4), which was the only point in the translation to which the Cardinal took exception, attributed to the sect over which I presided, (*hujus sectae*), and the letter I had written, *epistola praedicti Vicecomitis*, the *astutiam subtilem* mentioned in the paragraph.

It may also be pointed out (1) that 'the Provinces of Canterbury and York, which constitute the Church of England'—the expression used in my letter—is not a phrase open to any ambiguity; (2) that Canterbury is not easily confounded with Westminster, and further, that the Cardinal stated categorically that the bishops and clergy of the English and Irish Churches did not possess valid Orders, and that such bishops and clergy, whether Anglican or Irish, could only be considered as so many laymen, the precise point upon which the Pope had asked Mgr. Duchesne to draw up a memorandum.

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

BOVEY TRACEY VICARAGE,
NEWTON ABBOTT, October 30, 1894.

I had begun a letter to you, sending you the memorandum I had drawn up, telling you what it seemed to me possible the Archbishops of Canterbury and York might do, and asking your opinion as to the sort of '*démarche*' which it had occurred to me might be made from Rome with every prospect of advantage, and without any fear of stirring up Protestant difficulties, when some one drew my attention to Cardinal Vaughan's letters in the *Times* of Friday and Saturday, which I had not seen.

It seems to me useless, under the circumstances, to do anything more, or to give you the trouble of reading a long letter which would only waste your time.

As you know, I have endeavoured to believe and to induce others to believe all you told me about the Cardinal's dispositions. I am afraid it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to do so in future.

The translation of the Cardinal's letter, as the Cardinal tries to explain it, though it does not give the accurate meaning of the Latin, does convey the impression which any one reading that letter would receive. '*Astutiam*' and '*subtilem*' are words which speak for themselves, and words which I venture to think, if the Cardinal did not intend to convey the impression of cunning and deception, he ought not to have used. The impression, too, was false, for the wording of my letter and the terms and names employed, 'Church of England,' 'Provinces of Canterbury and York' precluded all possibility of mistake.

It appears, too, that if it had not been for an accident (for the Cardinal did not write for publication), I should not have known the impression he was giving of me and my conduct in Spain.

I am very willing to believe he did not intend all this, but the fact remains, and I think he ought—if he wishes to be just—to explain publicly to the Spanish bishops that he has done me an injustice. This, however, is a personal matter, and personal matters are matters of great indifference; but what is not a matter of indifference—for it affects other interests than mine—is that it shows how little wish the Cardinal has to see the good side of our position.

Surely a very little charity might have seen something else in my letter than what he found in it. Can you wonder that we should both believe and say that the last thing he and many of your people wish is to find out that our Orders are valid? On the contrary, is it not quite obvious, that there is nothing which they would so much dislike, and which, so far as they can, they would more endeavour to prevent.

What hope can there be of peace in face of such dispositions? How can you expect us not to resent them, or how can you wonder if persons like the Archbishop of Canterbury say disagreeable things in their turn, and urge the uselessness of any steps on their side towards re-union while the official representative of Rome in England uses such language and makes such communications?

I have been summoned here very suddenly by Mr. Courtenay's¹ illness and death, which was quite unexpected, and I don't quite know how long I may be kept.

This incident, unpleasant as it was, led to the following very generous letter from the Cardinal to me.

H. E. Cardinal Vaughan to Lord Halifax

2nd November 1894.

It is now a week since the unfortunate publication of the badly translated Latin letter which I thought it my duty to send to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo. I therefore venture to write directly to you to say how grieved I am at the pain I have caused you. I need not repeat what I said in my letter of correction to the *Times*; I am sure you will not even suspect me of thinking that you could wilfully deceive. I am the more pained by the publication of the private letter of brief notes sent to the Cardinal, because I have all along felt the necessity of charity and sympathy in dealing with the High Church movement, whilst at the same time I guarded myself against being misunderstood, against holding out false hopes, against want of perfect fidelity to the truth as I see it and to my duty. As I see things, you are so near the Catholic Church, and yet so far away. You are so good and sincere, and yet in so singular a position, that I am drawn in two directions: it is difficult for one so little skilled in the use of language as I am to combine

¹ The Rev. the Hon. Charles Leslie Courtenay.

one's thoughts, and to present everything in due proportion and relation ; but perhaps I have already said too much, and you will think that I am making bad worse by going on. I will therefore only add an expression of my kindest regards and an assurance that I will continue constantly to recommend you and yours to our Lord in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Pardon this long letter.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Vaughan

BOVEY TRACEY,
November 4, 1894.

I received your Eminence's letter only to-day. I am very grateful for it. I want your Eminence really to believe that though I was distressed at what had been written to Spain, thinking it did not help the cause of peace, and feeling, too, that what I had said did not deserve it (it had never entered my head for a moment that any one could misunderstand a letter which spoke of the 'Church of England' and the Provinces of Canterbury and York), I did not for an instant think that your Eminence meant to impute to me any intention to deceive.

I will only add that any pain to myself is more than wiped out by the thought that your Eminence will sometimes remember me at the Altar—and in your prayers.

How completely I dismissed the matter from my own mind may be seen from a letter written to Mr. Wilfrid Ward the next day, in which I say :—

I shall do my best to set matters straight, and will take an opportunity of showing the Cardinal's letter both to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York. The great thing when a mistake has been made (and who is there who does not make mistakes?) is to use it as means for a better understanding, and we must try to do so in the present case. Certainly you have done your best to help such a result, and I am very grateful to you.¹

In the meantime the Abbé Portal, who had only seen Cardinal Vaughan's public letters, wrote to the *Guardian* as follows :—

Les journaux anglais publient, à propos du sacre du

¹ Mr. Ward had written to the Cardinal on the subject.

Sñr. Cabrera, deux lettres de son Eminence le cardinal Vaughan, qui me forcent à entrer dans une polémique à laquelle je ne voulais pas, tout d'abord, prendre part. Son Eminence a écrit une lettre à l'archevêque de Tolède pour l'éclairer sur les sentiments de Lord Halifax et de la 'secte astucieuse' dont ce nobleman est le chef. J'ignore si l'archevêque a vu plus clair après la réception de cette lettre, mais, ce que je sais bien, c'est que l'impression produite sur tout le monde est des plus mauvaises. Même après la seconde lettre de son Eminence, il est vrai de dire de la première : '*Epistola ita scripta est, ut facile decipere posset.*' Soit dit sans offenser la loyauté de l'Eminentissime cardinal, pas plus qu'il n'a voulu lui-même émettre un doute sur l'indiscutable loyauté de Lord Halifax. En tout cas, je puis affirmer à vos lecteurs, que nos organes religieux et notre public n'ont pas apprécié la lettre de l'honorable Président de l'English Church Union, comme son Eminence le cardinal Vaughan. Tout le monde y a vu, au contraire, un témoignage de charité et un gage de paix. *L'Univers* l'a insérée avec quelques mots de sympathie, et le *Moniteur de Rome* l'a donnée en première page, en la faisant précéder de paroles élogieuses pour le 'nobleman.' Or, ce dernier journal, que Crispi vient d'étrangler, se publiait à Rome et ses attaches avec le Vatican ne sont un mystère pour personne. Je suis naturellement amené à parler d'une autre lettre que son Eminence a publiée il y a peu de temps et qui a produit une vive impression. Le cardinal a cru devoir intervenir, personnellement et publiquement, dans la controverse si délicate des Ordinations anglicanes. Il l'a fait en théologien, et a donné des raisons qui, d'après lui, établissent la nullité de ces ordinations. Ces raisons sont évidemment discutables, les théologiens peuvent les examiner, en peser la valeur, comme ils ont examiné et discuté les raisons apportées par d'autres théologiens haut placés, par des cardinaux ou par des Papes, tels que Benoit XIV. et Innocent IV. Je me propose même d'user bientôt de ce droit, dans un travail que je prépare en ce moment. Après la thèse, le cardinal a jugé à propos de dire que jamais Rome ne reconnaîtra la validité des Ordinations anglicanes. L'à-propos mis de côté, c'est là encore une opinion personnelle. Des écrivains anglais, catholiques et anglicans, ont vu dans cette phrase une attaque contre l'abbé Duchesne et aussi contre la Conclusion de mon travail sur les Ordinations anglicanes. Je n'ai pas à m'occuper de l'abbé Duchesne, encore moins à le défendre; l'éminent

critique remplit habituellement trop bien cette besogne, pour qu'on soit tenté de la faire pour lui, mais je ne puis pas croire que son Eminence en veuille à ma Conclusion. Des catholiques anglais, je ne l'ignore pas, la voient de mauvais œil, et je profite volontiers de l'occasion pour les prier de ne pas se contenter de la regarder ainsi *oculis torvis*. Qu'ils l'attaquent ouvertement, ils ne sauraient me faire de plus grand plaisir. En attendant, et jusqu'à nouvel ordre, je ne pense pas que le cardinal, au sujet de ma Conclusion, soit avec eux contre moi. De savoir si Rome changera ou ne changera pas d'attitude, chacun peut faire là-dessus des prédictions, à ses risques et périls, bien entendu. Son Eminence déclare que Rome ne changera pas ; c'est là, encore une fois, une opinion personnelle et privée. Une telle déclaration n'aurait, en effet, une valeur plus grande, que dans le cas où son Eminence aurait reçu un mandat officiel de l'autorité suprême. Ce mandat, le Cardinal Vaughan ne l'a pas reçu.

In order still further to mark the divergence between the attitude of Rome and that of Cardinal Vaughan, the Abbé published some extracts from a letter of Cardinal Rampolla to him of 19th September 1894. I give here the whole of that letter which was published *in extenso* in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* early in 1896. I also give the passage from Mgr. Cecconi, Archbishop of Florence, the historian of the Vatican Council, quoted by the Abbé Portal in the concluding pages of his pamphlet on English Ordinations—the subject which had elicited the Cardinal's letter. The passage from Mgr. Cecconi proves that he, like everybody else at that time, did not believe the question of the validity of English Ordinations to have been decided.

H. E. Cardinal Rampolla to the Abbé Portal

ROME, 19 septembre 1894.

Vous avez été bien aimable de penser à m'offrir l'opuscule sur les Ordinations anglicanes paru depuis peu sous le nom de Fernand Dalbus, et vous avez rendu votre don d'autant plus agréable que vous l'avez accompagné de nouvelles fort intéressantes relativement à la culture théologique et aux dispositions actuelles des membres les plus remarquables de l'Eglise anglicane, lesquels, comme vous le dites, en faisant des vœux

pour l'union soupirent avec impatience après le jour où tous ceux qui croient à la rédemption seront unis comme des frères dans une seule communion.

Je suis heureux de vous dire que, malgré les graves occupations de ma charge, j'ai parcouru avec beaucoup d'intérêt ce travail, dont on m'a beaucoup parlé. Et je dois avouer que j'ai ressenti un grand plaisir à voir une question si délicate traitée avec une sereine impartialité de jugement et dans un esprit uniquement porté à faire resplendir la vérité dans la charité.

Tout en m'abstenant d'entrer dans la question elle-même, il ne m'est pas possible de ne pas approuver la Conclusion de l'auteur, puisqu'elle est entièrement conforme aux sentiments exprimés il y a peu de temps par le Saint-Père dans sa lettre apostolique adressée aux princes et aux peuples de l'univers.

Dalbus croit que le mouvement intellectuel commencé à Oxford, et qui va se développant dans la communion anglicane parmi des hommes d'un esprit élevé, très érudits dans la science des antiquités chrétiennes et chercheurs loyaux du vrai, fera disparaître enfin les vieux préjugés, et, les ombres étant dissipées, ramènera à l'unité visible de l'Eglise de Jésus Christ la fille de Rome, la noble race des Anglais, que Grégoire le Grand initia par le baptême à la vie chrétienne et politique. Par là, le peuple anglais deviendrait complètement digne des hauts destins que la Providence lui réserve.

Aucun doute ne peut s'élever sur l'accueil affectueux que cette nation trouverait auprès de son antique mère et maîtresse, si cet heureux retour se produisait; car rien ne saurait égaler l'ardeur avec laquelle le Souverain Pontife qui gouverne aujourd'hui l'Eglise de Dieu, désire rétablir la paix et l'unité dans la grande famille chrétienne, et réunir comme en un seul faisceau toutes les forces du christianisme, pour les opposer efficacement au torrent d'impiété et de corruption qui déborde aujourd'hui de toute part. Certainement Sa Sainteté n'épargnerait ni travail, ni sollicitude, ni effort pour aplanir le chemin, pour apporter, où cela serait nécessaire, la lumière, et fortifier les volontés qui, tout en aimant le bien qu'elles connaissent, ne sauraient pas encore se résoudre à l'embrasser.

Un échange amical d'idées¹ et une étude plus soignée et plus

¹ Attention may be drawn to the fact that the conclusion of the pamphlet to which Cardinal Rampolla specially refers with approval had specifically mentioned the question of Orders as the first to be reopened, and the one most likely to facilitate the conferences in the interests of reunion which the Abbé Portal and I had aimed at from the beginning.

approfondie des anciennes croyances et pratiques de culte serait on ne peut plus utile pour préparer la voie à cette union désirée. Tout cela devrait se faire sans aucun mélange d'amertume et de récrimination ou de préoccupation d'intérêt terrestre, se tenant dans une sphère où l'on respirerait uniquement l'esprit d'humilité et de charité chrétienne, avec un sincère désir de paix et d'ardent amour pour l'œuvre immortelle de l'amour d'un Dieu, qui pria pour que les siens fussent tous une seule chose en lui, et n'hésita pas à cimenter cette union de tout son sang.

Que les membres de la communion anglicane aient la conviction, vive et profonde, comme elle doit l'être, que l'unité de l'Eglise est la volonté expresse de Jésus-Christ, que les divisions et la variété des croyances religieuses sont l'origine d'un état de choses qui répugne à la raison et déplaît à Dieu, et que ceux qui concourent à maintenir un pareil état de choses se rendent coupables devant Dieu et devant la société du plus grand bien dont ils la privent, et l'espérance du retour de l'Angleterre au centre unique de l'unité ne sera point vaine.

'Une nation,' comme dit Bossuet, 'une nation si savante, ne demeurera pas longtemps dans cet éblouissement : le respect qu'elle conserve pour les Pères, et ses curieuses et continuelles recherches sur l'antiquité la ramèneront à la doctrine des premiers siècles. Je ne puis croire qu'elle persiste dans la haine qu'elle a conçue contre la Chaire de Pierre, d'où elle a reçu le christianisme.' Dieu veuille que ces paroles d'un homme illustre aient été prophétiques ! Et on pourrait y ajouter maintenant, après deux siècles que, citoyens d'un pays libre, les Anglais ne peuvent pas ne pas désirer que le règne de la justice, de l'ordre et de la paix soit rétabli dans tout l'univers, et tel est justement le vœu très ardent du Souverain Pontife Léon XIII. Puisse ce vœu, accueilli avec ferveur et secondé avec sincérité, montrer l'aurore d'une renaissance religieuse générale, dont la société moderne a un si grand besoin, et mettre la nation anglaise à la tête de ce salutaire retour du monde à la vie chrétienne.

Recevez, révérend monsieur, mes remerciements pour votre gracieux envoi de la brochure, avec l'assurance de mon estime distinguée.

The following is the passage from Mgr. Cecconi :—

Tous les catholiques, et je ne crains pas de l'affirmer, le Saint Siège lui-même, seraient très heureux de voir entamer une

sérieuse et loyale discussion sur une matière où M. Cobb montre tant d'assurance [the validity of English Ordinations]; ce serait là un avantage précieux pour la science historique, et, ce qui vaut mieux, pour le salut des âmes, car on mettrait fin à une discussion historico-dogmatique ouverte il y a plus de trois siècles. . . . Que les anglicans produisent donc 'les preuves authentiques (documentary evidence), plus que suffisantes pour faire casser le verdict traditionnel rendu contre la validité de leurs Ordinations.' (Mgr. Cecconi, *Histoire du Concile du Vatican*—see *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. i. pp. 390-391.)

A letter from the Abbé Portal to me emphasized the situation.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

CAHORS, 16 novembre 1894.

Non, mon cher ami, jamais les vôtres ne trouveront une occasion plus propice, parce qu'ils ne rencontreront jamais un Pape alliant plus que Léon XIII. une véritable prudence à une grande audace.

Il me semble que votre voyage à Rome ne doit plus être retardée. Quelle que soit la lettre de l'archevêque de Canterbury, vous êtes sûr du résultat. Et maintenant, le Pape ne doit pas seulement donner des paroles, si bonnes soient-elles; vous devez obtenir autre chose. Il n'y a aucun inconvénient, ni théorique ni pratique, à ce que Rome décide que désormais les Ordinations des prêtres anglicans qui se convertiront soient refaites sous condition. Il faudrait obtenir ce changement, sans préjudice d'une étude ultérieure plus approfondie. Pensez bien à cela, et donnez-moi votre opinion.

This letter should be compared with the following 'Statement' in Cardinal Vaughan's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 175 :—

'All this time the friends of the Reunion movement had been exceedingly active in Rome. Following up their declared policy of treating the question of Anglican Orders as a point of contact, as the chosen subject for a first exchange of explanations, they were directing all their efforts to getting the matter reopened, and now were confident of success. Clearly the recognition of the Orders of the Church of England could not be a matter of

barter. Still, further research might lead to the conclusion that if not certainly valid, they were at least not certainly invalid. That would have this practical consequence, that then convert clergymen wishing to become Catholic priests would be ordained only conditionally. If that decision followed from a re-examination of the evidence it would be perfectly legitimate, and yet could be regarded as equivalent to a concession to Anglican views, and as removing a fruitful source of irritation. At the same time there was always the possibility—and at least one distinguished French scholar thought there was much more than a possibility—that the evidence would compel an admission of the certain validity of the disputed Orders.’

Meanwhile I was expecting the modified letter I hoped to receive from the Archbishop of Canterbury. I had been down to Addington, and I had invoked the good offices of the Archbishop of York. Writing to the Abbé I say :—

Je viens de voir l’archevêque d’York. Il doit aller à Addington, et il est tout à fait dans la disposition de faire tout son possible pour obtenir la lettre de l’archevêque de Cantorbéry que nous désirons. J’ai aussi parlé très longuement avec M. Ward. Le cardinal Vaughan va à Rome au mois de janvier. M. Ward paraissait croire qu’on n’était pas content de lui au Vatican, mais il a ajouté qu’après qu’on l’aura grondé le cardinal dira ce qu’il a à dire.

Mr. Ward, in a letter dated the 17th of November, after saying he thought it really important we should meet, went on :—

I have felt all along in a difficulty as to the discussion on Anglican Orders, because I am sure that Rome will never do more than say that Abbé Duchesne’s view is tenable ; so that conditional reordination is sure to be necessary. Also, I can’t feel sanguine about the result of a direct *rapprochement* with Rome in view of the strong Protestant feeling of the country (Protestant as against Rome). But if anything could be done, as you think, which would increase the disposition on both sides to be thoroughly fair to each other—and it needs increasing on both sides—I should be too delighted. But for this purpose the more we can act together the better ; and I think that now the Cardinal will wish as an *amende* for the past [*i.e.*, the Toledo letter], to do what he can.

Mr. Ward and I dined together on the 22nd when I gave him the promised copy of the Abbé Portal's memorandum recounting his interview with the Pope and Cardinal Rampolla, together with a sketch of the sort of letter I conceived the Pope might write to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York without any fear of misunderstanding, upon which I asked him to ascertain the Duke of Norfolk's opinion.

On the 23rd he wrote :—

I think the Abbé's notes show great tact and perception. Your sketch for the Pope is very touching, and most of it would stand I fancy, but several phrases could not be adopted in Rome, I am sure. Of course, at the very best, the Pope cannot acknowledge that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have any valid jurisdiction. Duchesne is quite as explicit about that as any one else. I believe the only solution to lie in very general terms. I think the point you and the Abbé make as to the good effect of the last words of the aged Pope being words of charity is a very true one.

I am disposed to think that if the Pope, understanding the true proportions of the various schools of thought within the Church of England, wished to do something of this kind, and if a sufficiently warm response were secured beforehand, some good might come of it. But you must remember that Rome has practically treated Anglican Orders as null and void in the past, so he cannot speak as your draft makes him. I am afraid also that at the present stage he could not address the Archbishops in any way implying that they were on a different footing from, say, the Bishop of Jerusalem appointed in '43. But this could, no doubt, be veiled so as not to give offence. If your Archbishops were as anxious as the Pope is, I should feel hopeful of something. But at present I don't see my way through difficulties which could only be surmounted by a strong wish on both sides.

In a subsequent letter dated 26th November, he said :—

The Duke is reading your papers with great interest. At present he is, I think, puzzled as to the Archbishop of Canterbury's attitude, and that, as you know, is my great difficulty.

My anxiety to hear from the Archbishop of Canterbury

was not diminished by a letter from Mr. Wilfrid Ward, dated 10th December. In that letter Mr. Ward said :—

I have been expecting to hear from you about the Archbishop's letter. Now I have just read the Archbishop of York's words in to-day's *Times*¹ expressing distinctly that he does not wish for corporate union. As he says this independently of any conditions, I suppose it is a significant utterance, and puts the step you had contemplated out of the question. As you know, I felt from the first that a great deal turned on the attitude of the Archbishops. It rather looks to me as though they wish to make the most of the Cardinal's aggressiveness as a reason for holding aloof from a movement towards Rome which would put them in a very difficult position with a large section of members of the Church of England. But you will judge of that better than I.

The Duke² feels strongly that if your people privately³ induce the Pope to speak publicly, the Pope will appear to have taken the initiative, and the response in the present state of public opinion might be such as to place the Pope in a very false position—even a ridiculous position—as though he had attempted a *coup* and utterly failed. But if any of *you* are disposed to approach the Pope publicly, making sure privately of a favourable response, he thinks good might result. I think the events of the last two weeks go far to confirm this view, and much as I wish that something could be done, I don't see my way, in view of the attitude of the Archbishops, and of the

¹ Mr. Ward had entirely misunderstood the Archbishop of York's letter to which he refers. See letter from the Archbishop, dated 15th December, p. 166.

² Extract of letter, Duke of Norfolk to Wilfrid Ward, dated 2nd December 1894 :—

My own feeling is that there is considerable danger in anything taking place which the public does not clearly understand to spring from an initiative taken by the Anglicans. If they are disposed by private negotiations to draw from the Pope some public expression of anxiety for re-union, I confess I should greatly fear the outcome of any such proceeding. The result is very likely to be that the Pope will find himself in the position of either giving an invitation which is snubbed and laughed at, or of having shown an expectation of a Romewards tendency in England which may arouse a perfect storm of no-Popery indignation and ridicule. Such a storm might be of spiritual benefit to the victims of it, but it should not be provoked deliberately.

³ That the communications were to be private was not any suggestion of mine, or of the Abbé Portal. Writing from Rome, in a letter dated 17th September, the Abbé says : ' J'aurais préféré une lettre publique.' See also Memorandum, p. 132.

sentiments of such men as Canon Fleming and many another, to being hopeful of any good result from any communication from Rome to Canterbury. On the other hand, I believe Rome would go into the question of Anglican Orders if (say) the Church Union asked it, and would invoke the aid of Anglican divines. Gasquet, who is greatly in the Cardinal's confidence, says the Cardinal would favour this. . .

You will see a letter, I hope, in the coming *Guardian* from me on the Orders question. I feel that Newman's view is the true one. I think there is good ground for a convinced Anglican to believe in his Orders, but not for us. I have expressed my sympathy with the tone of Dalbus and Duchesne.

Lord Halifax to the Archbishop of Canterbury

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
December 12, 1894.

I have been anxiously hoping for and expecting a letter from your Grace. The Archbishop of York told me he was to see your Grace at Addington about a fortnight ago, and I had in consequence almost counted on a letter from your Grace which should enable me to decide in what way the present situation, so far as the little I can do is concerned, can be turned to the best account.

Rightly or wrongly—I trust rightly, for it would not be to the credit of the Church of England if it were not so—the authorities at Rome have been given to understand that there is a real desire for unity in England, on the basis of the faith of the Undivided Church; and as a step towards such reunion—though obviously a very remote one—Rome has been induced to take steps to look into our Orders, in a way she has never done before, and under conditions the most favourable to ourselves.

Simultaneously with this, there have been, whether intended or not, very unfriendly—to say the least of it—utterances on the part of the Ecclesiastical Head of the English Roman Catholics, which, however, are known to have been viewed with disfavour at Rome. It is obvious that nothing can be easier than by a mistake on our side to play into the hands of Cardinal Vaughan, and to give the impression at Rome that his view of the Anglican Church is the right one, and in consequence to throw back the favourable dispositions of the Pope, and to risk all that might be obtained under present circumstances from

the investigations of the Abbé Duchesne (a most favourable critic) into our Orders. It was for this reason that I so earnestly besought your Grace to write me such a letter as I had ventured to put together out of the two letters your Grace had been good enough to send me.

May I still ask it, and with all the earnestness of which I am capable. There was nothing in that letter which could compromise any one. It merely gave expression, if one may say so, to sentiments which every one who believes in the Catholic Church must feel. Will not your Grace trust me in this, and accede to my prayer? In any case will your Grace let me have back the letters your Grace was good enough to send me, which I left at Addington the last time I was there?

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
December 12, 1894.

I should have written before, but I have been putting off every day beginning my letter in hopes of hearing something from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York. I have not done so, and I have had nothing from either. I am writing again to both of them to-day.

Nothing must be done which can in any way compromise Rome or our Archbishops, but I am positive something might be done on both sides which could do nothing but good.

As you know, I care only for the end, which is reunion, and if that were to be obtained by my being burnt to-morrow, I hope I should care little for the consequences to myself; but the sort of article which I send you from this Irish paper—which, no doubt, is sent to every one—does not induce Anglican authorities to be favourable. I heard of the Cardinal having made the Bishop of Marlborough frantic the other day.¹

¹ Letter from Mr. W. J. Birkbeck:—

I saw Canon Browne * this morning [3rd December], and in the course of conversation he asked me whether I did not think that Lord Halifax was being led into a trap by Rome (I had not mentioned *you* in any way, but we were talking about 'Dalbus,' and the letters which had appeared in the *Guardian*), and that the object of all these letters was to raise the hopes of Anglicans with a view of dashing them to the ground by a Papal Declaration against our Orders, and so promoting a large secession to Rome!

We had at the Church Historical Society a very amusing letter from

* The Rev. George Forrest Browne, Canon of St. Paul's, consecrated Bishop of Stepney, 21st April 1895, translated to Bristol 1897.

Keep the papers ¹ I left with you till I hear from you again.

My own inclination is to see the Cardinal and talk to him quite openly. I detest concealment, and I think in these matters diplomacy is a mistake. If reunion is to be brought about, it will not be by man's skill or wisdom, but by the goodness of God, and many prayers.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

MOLESCROFT, EASTBOURNE,

December 13, 1894.

The Cardinal has just written that he wants to see me before he goes to Rome. I will try and arrange that this should be on one of the days on which you are up. My own impression is that the Archbishops feel in a difficult position, and that you will not really get what you wish from them, less from any want of good-will than from their knowledge of the strength of the anti-Roman feeling in your Church. This is, alas! the great difficulty, that only a small section wishes for reunion. I confess I don't see how this is to be got over in any action that may be taken.

But I believe that some conferences on the Orders question could be obtained at your request, and I think it not unlikely that Cardinal Vaughan would enter into this. I really think your best plan is to see the Cardinal and tell him all.² If your

the Bishop of Marlborough * asking us to provide anti-Popery lectures in his church in the city for mid-days twice a week throughout Lent, as a counter-blast to 'Peacock' Vaughan, so he called him! It appears that he has been lashed into a state of rabid and uncontrollable 'No Popery' frenzy by a rude remark of the Cardinal's, who, when he met him at some private party, on the Bishop in conversation quoting something in Latin, replied, 'Do Anglican bishops really know Latin?' Really the Cardinal's red hat does not seem to have improved his manners!

¹ A memorandum containing the Abbé Portal's account of his own action, of what had passed at Rome, and the sketch of the sort of letter which I had satisfied myself the Pope could write to the English Archbishops in the interests of reunion without exciting the susceptibilities of any one in England.

² The Cardinal, however, had already been told everything. In *Leaves from My Diary*, pp. 2 and 3, after saying that 'some letters and papers were placed in my hands in the evening of this day (5th December 1894),' Abbot Gasquet, quoting from those papers (who had shown them to him, I do not know, except that the Abbot has said it was not Mr. Ward), gives the actual phrases of the Memorandum, which was written in French. Two days later (7th December, *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 3), he notes,

* Rt. Rev. Alfred Earle, consecrated Bishop of Marlborough 18th February 1888, resigned 1900, Dean of Exeter 1900.

own people were more with you, you might have some prospect of acting by yourselves with some effect, but as it is, I doubt your having any. But anyhow it is more natural and satisfactory to talk it out with him. His acts are always kind, though I don't feel sure that he will think anything possible. Still, he is sure not to prejudice you with the Holy See. I own that the absence of signs of any considerable number of Anglicans feeling with you makes me very doubtful that anything can be done with effect. The wish for reunion in any sense seems almost absent.¹ How different from the state of things in the Oxford party from '39 onwards, of which I am reading in Wiseman's correspondence.

How little the Cardinal desired 'not to prejudice' the cause the Abbé Portal and I had at heart 'with the Holy See' may be judged from the following passage from Abbot Gasquet's *Leaves from My Diary* (pp. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11), which on account of its importance I insert here rather than as a footnote:—

He [the Cardinal] then proceeded to give me a long account of an interview he had had with the Pope on arriving, of which the following are the principal points. On his reaching Rome, the Saturday week before [19th January 1895], he was sent for immediately by the Pope. Directly he entered the Pope's room, the Holy Father began at once about his great desire to effect the 'reunion of England' with the Holy See. He had been anxiously awaiting his (that is, the Cardinal's) arrival to carry out the purpose he had conceived of addressing a personal letter of invitation to the Anglican Archbishops. . . . At the end of a very long speech, the Holy Father said: 'And now I want you to help me in this.' Cardinal Vaughan, who all this

'I had an interview with Cardinal Vaughan this morning, in the course of which I told him . . . what I understood from the papers shown me . . . was going on in regard to reunion, and the desire of our Anglican friends to reopen the question of their Orders.' Cardinal Vaughan, therefore, must either have been in possession of the facts, or have been misinformed as to them by Abbot Gasquet. In either case it is difficult to understand, in view of his subsequent interview with Mr. Athelstan Riley before he went to Rome, how he was able to give so misleading an account of what had occurred as that contained in the statement he made to the Pope a few weeks later. See *Leaves from My Diary*, pp. 9, 10, 11.

¹ How little this was the fact may be seen by a reference to the answers elicited by my address on Reunion, delivered at Bristol, 14th February 1895, p. 187, *et seq.*

time had said nothing, immediately replied: 'Your Holiness has evidently been entirely misinformed as to the real attitude of the English people to the Roman Church. The vast majority of Englishmen are without question thoroughly Protestant in every sense. A small and energetic minority, it is true, against the protests of the majority, now call themselves Catholics, and have adopted many of the practices and language of the Catholic Church. But even these are unanimous in rejecting what we hold to be the foundation of the Catholic religion, the authority of the Church and of the Supreme Pontiff. . . . With regard to your Holiness's intention of sending a letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York,' the Cardinal continued, 'this project has been known for some time in England, and much discussed. I know for a fact that drafts of such a letter have been suggested and sent round to various people to know whether a letter of such and such a kind would meet with *their* approval if written. And moreover, the Archbishop of Canterbury has been approached and asked to receive your Holiness's communication at least with civility.' On hearing this the Pope appeared to be greatly astonished, and said that this was entirely new to him, and that he had given no authority to any one to do this.

The Cardinal then went on to say that this was not all. Six months ago a French priest had come to England, and had stayed for some considerable time in Anglican circles. He had visited the Cowley Fathers, Anglican convents, and, he believed, Anglican bishops, allowing it to be understood that he came with the knowledge and, in an unofficial way, on behalf of Rome. The Pope thereupon declared that he had never given any one such authority or even thought of such a thing. The Cardinal, however, declared that this was the view which was taken of his mission in England by Anglicans, and colour was to a certain extent given to it by the fact that the said French priest studiously avoided paying even the visit of courtesy due to English ecclesiastical authority, and, indeed, kept out of the way of Catholics altogether.

Further, that he (Cardinal Vaughan) had it on the authority of a Catholic priest,¹ who had himself seen it in Abbé Portal's own writing, that he had been received at the Vatican by the

¹ Obviously Abbot Gasquet, who had been shown the Abbé Portal's Memorandum, a fact of which I was not aware till the publication of the Abbot's *Diary*.

Holy Father, who had expressed to him his personal desire to consent to anything to bring back England to the Church, and that the Abbé Portal had recommended the Pope to take the extraordinary course of writing to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. The Pope appeared much disturbed about the whole matter having been known and discussed in England.

The statement, as it stands, is absolutely incorrect. The Abbé's visit to England in August, when he had visited the Cowley Fathers, Anglican convents, and Anglican bishops, allowing it to be understood, according to the Cardinal, that he came with the knowledge and, in an unofficial way, on behalf of Rome, was before he had been sent for to Rome, and had seen Cardinal Rampolla and the Pope. The Abbé neither gave, nor could have given, any such impression.

In regard to the Abbé's second visit to England in September, when Cardinal Rampolla's letter, and what the Pope was prepared to do, had been communicated to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, no mistake was possible, as I had myself written to Cardinal Rampolla on the subject, and Cardinal Vaughan had, by my desire, been put in possession of all the facts by Mr. Athelstan Riley (p. 173, *et seq.*).

I eventually heard from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 14th of December, finally declining to accept the modifications of the letter, I had suggested. 'All,' the Archbishop said, that he had 'openly and avowedly before him' was that the representative of the Roman Church in England had gone with more and more violence and contumely into an assault on Anglican orders and the whole Anglican position, that there was no proof that Cardinal Vaughan had not the Vatican at his back, that any action on his (the Archbishop's) part 'was by the nature of the case public action, and that it was impossible for him to accept private utterances of what was going on' at Rome.¹

¹ For full text of the letter, see Archbishop Benson's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 611.

Writing the next day, 15th December, the Archbishop of York says :—

Forgive my silence. I have been overwhelmed with work. As regards my brother of Canterbury, I found when I went to Addington that he had made up his mind not to write anything further upon the Roman question. He thought that he had said enough. For the present, therefore, I fear that nothing more can be done.

As regards myself, Mr. Ward has entirely misunderstood what I said—probably from my own faulty expression of what was in my mind, and I may say in my heart also. I do long for union between England and Rome, but it seemed to me that the Vatican Council and (*longo intervallo*) Cardinal Vaughan had postponed that hope indefinitely, and that if I had spoken of it in my letter, it would only have alarmed some of our more timid people without doing any good. It was implied, however, in what I said as to the ultimate fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for unity. The expression 'without any corporate union' was intended to indicate a temporary and preparatory condition of things. I wrote my letter entirely in the interests of peace, and of good-will towards the Church of Rome, and only used the reference to Cardinal Vaughan as a peg on which to hang it. I return the copy of your letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I shall be much interested in learning what answer you receive.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, 17 décembre 1894.

Enfin j'ai une réponse ¹ de l'archevêque de Canterbury.

J'ai fait mon possible pour avoir quelque chose de mieux, mais j'ai échoué.

La lettre du 15 octobre reste telle qu'elle était. Je saurai demain, probablement, quand le cardinal doit partir pour Rome.

Je vais rédiger le mémoire que je vous enverrai. Je verrai le cardinal, je lui dirai que j'avais eu l'intention d'aller à Rome, mais que c'est beaucoup mieux qu'il dise d'abord au Saint Père tout ce qu'il veut, et que si je vais à Rome un peu plus tard, ce qui est probable, même certain, je ferai de mon mieux pour faire comprendre au Pape qu'il y a des choses en

¹ The Archbishop's letter of 14th December.

Angleterre que le Cardinal ne connaît pas, surtout la manière d'agir pour amener l'Angleterre à l'unité.

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward.

ATHENÆUM CLUB,
PALL MALL, December 19, 1894.

We had not as much time for our conversation to-day as I should have liked, but I was glad of the opportunity of showing you the Archbishop's letter.¹ I am writing to the Cardinal to ask if he will see me to-morrow or early on Friday.

On the general subject I want to make certain things quite plain :

(1) I am not sanguine of much being done at present, but a beginning may be made, and even the very slightest beginning is a great thing. If the Cardinal would try to imagine what his feelings would be if his whole position were assailed, his orders denied, and all that he held most sacred, treated as non-existent, he would be able to understand how the sort of things he has been saying publicly of late—above all the way in which they have been said—are calculated to hinder anything very gracious on the part of Anglican bishops. It is just because they do believe in themselves and their position that they resent it. I am the last person to wish any one to compromise what they believe to be truth, but I do believe that a different attitude would produce very different results, and as I told you, while I am convinced that any approach made by a section of the Anglican Communion to Rome could only be productive of mischief, I feel very sure—if attention is paid to the wording of what was written—that the Pope in his position, and at his age, might take a step which would appeal, not to one section only of the Church of England, but to all. The Lambeth Conference and the Anniversary of St. Augustine's Mission is an opportunity. I think I told you that some such action on the part of the Pope as I had shadowed out seemed to one in the confidence of the *Record*² as bound to be well received by all. Meanwhile, it is quite essential, it is only fair and just before anything of that sort is done, or even considered, that the Pope should be

¹ Of the 15th October.

² Important as showing the attitude of the 'Evangelical' party.

made thoroughly to understand the state of affairs in England, and that anything which might be put out should be of a nature not to please such as myself, but the whole Church of England. This is essential, and in all I have said and done, I have not thought what I should like, but what was likely to do good all round, in other words, what both the Archbishop of Canterbury could do without compromising himself, and what the Holy See could do also, without exposing itself to the danger of any rebuff, or making difficulties for itself in England. For all our sakes we don't want to run the risk of stirring up a 'No Popery' cry. It may be that I am too sanguine and go too fast, but you know it is quite possible to lose a great deal from fear of venturing something. Meanwhile, I shall hope to see the Cardinal, and if I do, I shall tell him quite openly that I had hoped to have gone to Rome before this, that I am hoping to go there later, no doubt after he has been there, and that I shall be grateful to him (except in confidence), not to say anything about me, since any little thing I may be able to do in the interests of peace will be utterly ruined if I am supposed to be meddling in such matters. I shall add that I mention my movements to him because I hate all want of openness, and even the appearance of 'intrigue'; that I still think, as I said to him at least two years ago, a sympathetic attitude such as that taken up in your letter in regard to our orders would produce the best result, and I hope and trust he will press this upon the Pope, at least that he will not make matters worse than they are. (It is really very much his fault that matters are as they are.) Both here and abroad, nothing much can be done till public opinion has been educated, and I, for one, mean to do my best to make our people see what a duty it is to try to make peace, and to do what lies in our power to prepare the way for reconciliation before we die.

I shall send the Abbé a careful memorandum on the position of things here, which he may send on to Cardinal Rampolla if he sees fit.

I do not doubt that if my memorandum (should I write one) is too favourable, the Cardinal,¹ when he is at Rome, will correct that impression.

Two days later I added :—

Believe me—a letter from the Pope to the Archbishops,

¹ Cardinal Vaughan.

carefully worded, would do more to promote good feeling than words can possibly say. There is a profound latent feeling for peace and reunion which a word would kindle, but it all depends on *how* the word is said.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

MOLESCROFT, EASTBOURNE,
Christmas Day, 1894.

I think that it would be a very good thing for you to see the Cardinal before he starts on the 7th.

I do not feel that *I* can recommend the Pope's addressing Canterbury and York, though I should be delighted for him to do so if it would do good, and I don't think the Pope would object. I do not judge from their letters that their attitude is such as to make me feel sure that the Pope's overtures would have the weight they ought to have. But if you think otherwise, I think the Cardinal, and any one else, would be very glad that your views should be known. Why not arrange to see Cardinal Rampolla before anything final is done? As you say, there is no hurry. I don't think the Cardinal would in the least object. I know he would be glad to talk it all over with you, and I really think that will be the best way of ensuring that all you have to say will be considered.

I believe that something to the Archbishops might be expedient even, if all members of the Established Church were no more anti-Roman than they are. But the case is otherwise, and I should have great fear of a snubby answer from the Archbishops in consequence of their fearing to offend the anti-Romans, and to arouse a no-Popery cry in England.

May I remark incidentally that the Archbishop's address in last *Guardian* seems impossible. I am always urging on our people that the Anglican view is serious and needs being taken very seriously and weighed carefully, but when the Archbishop says that England was never Roman Catholic, and thus throws over entirely Newman's old *via media*, and goes in the teeth of patent facts, I don't know what to say. The position which I understand is the *Guardian's*—that we are members of the *unreformed* Church of England. The Reformation was justified only because English Catholicism had degenerated into Roman Catholicism. But to say that England was never Roman

Catholic, and to bring such proofs, and to propose to teach Anglican children such patent contradictions to facts, all this quite ties my hands. I can't urge our people to treat such remarks seriously or respectfully. They betoken in my mind a most painful unreality, and a refusal to look at facts at all.

Forgive my saying this, but you will understand that I really do so in the interests of mutual understanding.

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

So far as I am concerned, you are preaching to the converted. Nothing can appear to me more mistaken than the line adopted in the Archbishop's address, and which you characterise as it deserves. It is to me the height of unreality, and I think it a passing wonder that he, or any one who knows anything of history, can write as he does. I honestly do think, and the more I think the matter over, the more clearly I seem to see, that Anglicans have a position which they may be proud to defend, but assuredly it is not on the grounds on which the Archbishop appears to rely. I am endeavouring to get what I think into order for two speeches which I am to make at Leeds and Bristol shortly, when I hope to deal with the whole subject of reunion, and when I intend, whatever may be the consequences, and whether people like it or not, to say at all events some of the things which I think on the subject. I hope and believe you will not find much to disagree with in what I shall say. I only very imperfectly saw what the Archbishop said at Ashford, which I suppose is the speech you are referring to—but I know his line, and I know also that I entirely disagree with it.

To say that England was not Roman Catholic, in the ordinary sense of those words, from the Conquest, and before, is ridiculous; to say that much which is covered by that term is of the *de esse* of the Church is another thing altogether, and one which I believe cannot be proved. To say that the Anglican reformers were largely influenced by the ideas then current which afterwards crystallised and developed into what has come to be called Protestantism is one thing, to say that because they were thus influenced they *intended* to cut themselves off from the past is another. Even if some of them intended to do so, it

does not follow that they were allowed to accomplish their purpose.

For myself, I firmly believe that if Edward VI. had lived '*actum esse de Ecclesia Anglicana.*' To say that the Pope has a position in some sense at least *jure divino* does not necessarily involve the consequence that there are no circumstances in which he may not be resisted. Nor does it follow that because schism is the worst of evils, there may not be circumstances in which the guilt of schism is so evenly balanced that it is difficult to apportion its consequences as they affect one side or the other. No one can deny that a reformation was needed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; no one can deny that Rome and politics were great obstacles in the way of this reform. The situation was not then as clearly defined as it has appeared to be since. It was quite possible for good men who equally believed in the Catholic Church to take either side, and that once granted, everything else follows. What we have to do is by justice, impartiality, confession of our own faults, charity, historical research, a candid confession of ignorance when we don't know, and a resolute determination *not* to manipulate facts for the sake of pre-conceived theories, to endeavour to pave the way for mutual understanding, and eventually reconciliation. That Rome has a great deal to reconsider I cannot doubt. It is infinitely more difficult for her to do so than for us, but what we can all do is to try to have open minds, really to desire unity, and to determine that while what is essential must be insisted upon, *i.e.*, all that touches the Incarnation, and the means by which the relations between God and man are renewed and sustained, other things may be left and not made articles *stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiae*. How can we wonder that Christendom should be what it is, when we remember that excommunication was thought a proper method for enforcing the payment of tithe.

Edward Talbot,¹ who is here, to whom I ventured to show your letter, is quite in accord with what I have said to you.

I must add that the *via mediæ* does not commend itself to me; there is only one Church: the question is, what is necessary in order to belong to it.

The preceding letters, as will be seen, refer almost entirely

¹ The Rev. Edward Stuart Talbot, the Warden of Keble College, later Bishop of Rochester, Bishop of Southwark, and now Bishop of Winchester.

to the letter from Leo XIII. to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, of which there had been question ever since the Abbé Portal's audience with the Pope. The subject is referred to in Cardinal Vaughan's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 175, where it is stated that towards the end of 1894 Abbot Gasquet 'brought the grave news that if the leaders of the Reunion movement were well informed, Leo XIII. had definitely decided to write a personal letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.'¹ The Cardinal, however, did not hear of the proposal of such a letter only from Abbot Gasquet. I had always desired to treat him with the greatest openness. At the first beginning of the movement I had gone to him and asked his help; Mr. Ward, who was in constant communication with the Cardinal, had seen all the papers, Abbot Gasquet had certainly seen them; and now, with a view to the possibility of such a letter, being unable at the last moment, owing to illness, to go myself, I had begged Mr. Athelstan Riley, who was well acquainted with the Cardinal, in consequence of their communications in regard to the Education Question, to take an

¹ Cf. *Leaves from My Diary*, by Abbot Gasquet, p. 1:—

'December 5th.—Some letters and papers were placed in my hands in the evening of this day [5th Dec. 1894], from which I learned the following: the Abbé Portal, a French Lazarist, who, under the name of Dalbus, had written a pamphlet on "English Ordinations," had been three weeks in England in consultation with certain prominent Anglicans. It was said that he had come to the conclusion that to bring about a union, or discussion leading to a union, of the Anglican with the Roman Church, "les ordres offriraient un excellent terrain." From England the Abbé went to Rome, and, interesting Cardinal Rampolla in his scheme, was received by the Pope on the 12th of September [1894]. After having told the Holy Father what he had seen of the Anglicans in England, and what he believed to be the actual religious state of the English Church, and the disposition of its members in regard to reunion, the Pope asked him if he himself could do anything to promote the union of the Churches. To this Portal replied by suggesting that the Pope should write a letter on the subject to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. This at the time was agreed to; but two days later the Abbé was informed that it was, on reflection, considered better to wait for a time before such a letter was written.

'Portal says that at the time of his interview he saw his pamphlet *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, on the Pope's table, and he desired his Anglican friends to believe that there had never been "une telle démarche de la part de Rome." The Abbé Duchesne, too, had been chosen, he says, to write his views upon the question of the validity of the English Orders, and this manifests on the part of the Roman authorities "un si grand désir d'envisager les choses sous le point de vue le plus favorable pour cette église."

opportunity of calling upon him in order to discuss the question of such a letter as I thought the Pope might write to the Archbishops, or to the body of bishops assembling at Lambeth for the Lambeth Conference and the thirteenth centenary of St. Augustine's Mission, without any compromise of principle, without any risk of creating fresh difficulties, and with, as I believed, a well-founded hope of doing much to promote the cause of reunion.

Mr. Athelstan Riley saw the Cardinal in the first days of January, and the following letter, enclosing a memorandum of the interview, contains the account of what passed :—

Mr. Athelstan Riley to Lord Halifax

I had a very long talk with the Cardinal this afternoon. He was exceedingly friendly, and made me talk with the utmost freedom.

I began by stating the state of affairs as I understood them, and found that he generally recognised it, though he does not apparently know all the ins and outs of the matter. He last saw Wilfrid Ward about three weeks ago, and I suppose had his information up to date then. I enclose a memorandum of our conversation, or rather of my representations on your behalf to him. I think they fairly give the sense of our conversation at Hickleton. I told the Cardinal about the Archbishop's two letters (for you to send to Rampolla) : he had heard of the first (and knew its contents roughly), but not of the second. I told him you would probably forward the letter. As you directed, I concealed nothing from him, but put the whole matter before him as clearly as I could.

The impression left on my mind was this, that the Cardinal had received, or was expecting, some order from Rome, to adopt a rather more conciliatory attitude towards us. He was rather shocked, I think, at the idea of the Pope writing direct to our Archbishops, though he admitted that *this* Pope might do such a thing. The regular method, he said, would be for the Pope to address us through him. I told him that I thought this would do no good, but more harm. He then told me to speak quite plainly and tell him how he was regarded by Anglicans ; and I took him at his word and told him that he was exceedingly unpopular with us, and the reason. I said further that I did not think he understood our position, and this made him wound

us deeply whenever he said anything about us, which was fairly often. I added that I knew the Archbishop of Canterbury made it very aggravating to him, but that, on the other hand, he was just as aggravating to the Archbishop of Canterbury. We discussed this at great length : the Cardinal was evidently much interested in hearing our opinion of his utterances, and was, I think, a little surprised at hearing they gave such offence. I don't think he means to be quite as bitter as he is. The Toledo affair has, too, evidently vexed him very much, and I think that Pope or no Pope, he will be more guarded in his utterances in the future. My memorandum is very rough, written in a hurry, so please excuse its shortcomings. I may say that the Cardinal seemed to agree with all my representations except those which referred to the letter being addressed directly to the Archbishops. He did not speak strongly about this, but my impression is that he would not favour such a course. He quite agreed with what I said as to the character of such a letter if it were written, and he wants to see the suggested letter you drafted. Can you send him this ¹ before he goes to Rome on the 7th ?

Memorandum of an interview between Cardinal Vaughan and Mr. Athelstan Riley, containing the representations of the latter respecting the proposed letter from the Pope to the Church of England.

1. That any step which promoted a more friendly feeling between Rome and the Church of England would be of great value as :

- (1) Rendering the theological controversy less bitter, and so preparing the way for a temperate discussion of the grave questions which divide us.
- (2) Quite apart from the question of reunion, making it easier for the two Communions to take common action in such matters as education, and in other affairs which touch first Christian principles, upon which both are agreed, and which are now being attacked by the forces of secularism.

2. That the 1897 Commemoration of the Landing of St. Augustine, when the next Lambeth Conference is to be held,

¹ Draft of proposed letter from the Pope, see p. 135.

is a great opportunity for the proposed step on the part of the Vatican.

3. That considering the Pope's age, it would be well if some preliminary communication could take place.

4. That to ignore the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in making this communication would offend Anglicans, and probably do more harm than good.

5. That to address the members of the Church of England through Cardinal Vaughan—the natural channel of Papal communication—would be particularly unfortunate, as the Cardinal, for various reasons which it is not necessary to state, is extremely unpopular with all classes of Anglicans, and is commonly believed by them to represent the most hostile attitude of Rome towards the Church of England. But the present Pope, on the other hand, is regarded by Anglicans as a liberal and sympathetic Pontiff, and is consequently not a little respected.

6. But at the same time a letter from the Pope to the Cardinal on the subject would give no offence provided that a letter was also addressed to the English Archbishops.

7. That though the Archbishops of Canterbury and York may be afraid of compromising themselves, that they and others may dread a 'No Popery' cry, and may not feel sure of the attitude of the Low Church party in the event of their entering into a correspondence with Rome, and that though for these reasons the two Archbishops might not respond as satisfactorily as might be wished to the Pope's letter, no such apprehension need be felt as regards the Lambeth Conference, it being practically certain that the Anglican bishops then assembled would give a sympathetic reply to a sympathetic Papal communication.

8. Taking the above into consideration, it is suggested that the Pope might write a letter to the Archbishops so worded as to avoid the necessity of any direct reply before the letter had been brought before the meeting of the Lambeth Conference.

9. That this letter should be of the following character :

(a) It should lay stress upon the age of the Pope, his Holiness writing as one going to his account and desiring to promote peace as far as possible before his death. This appeal to English sentiment would be a powerful antidote to English anti-Romanism.

(b) It should set forth the Pope's well-known desire for the Reunion of Christendom and its *raison d'être*

should be the commemoration of the landing of Augustine.

- (c) It should carefully avoid all controversial matters.
 - (d) It would greatly help forward its cordial acceptance by English Churchmen, if the Pope saw fit to mention that he proposed to institute a careful inquiry into the question of English Orders as a proof of his good will.
 - (e) At the same time the letter should gently hint that there are grave questions between us quite apart from the matter of the validity of Anglican Orders. This would prevent any suspicion that Rome was abandoning her principles, and at the same time would forestall a similar assertion on the part of Anglican critics.
10. That a letter drafted on these lines would :
- (a) Be cordially welcomed by the High Church party.
 - (b) Be unobjectionable to the Low Church party.
 - (c) Be popular with Englishmen as a whole.

11. That the good impression created by such a letter would be immediate, could hardly fail to have important results, and would do much to promote the cause of reunion when the Lambeth Conference met in the summer.

12. That a letter on these lines had already been drafted by Lord Halifax, and shown to certain Roman Catholics of good judgment, who were of opinion that it was not an impossible letter for the Pope to write, and to certain Low Churchmen, who thought that such a Papal letter would give no offence to persons of their opinions.

13. That Rome has nothing to lose and everything to gain by taking such a step as that now under discussion. Even in the case of her receiving a rebuff from the Anglican bishops she would be the gainer, for such action would have won the respect of all right-minded people, who had the interests of Christendom at heart.

That, however, as stated by his biographer, was not the opinion of the Cardinal. He felt that any such letter could only result from a complete misconception, as he understood it, of the whole position of the Church of England. The only letter the Pope could write would be an invitation to the Archbishops to come and make their submission. Such an invitation he knew was useless. He urged Abbot Gasquet

to start for Rome without delay, and he himself went a week later.¹

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

Décembre 1894.

Je vous envoie une lettre d'un docteur de Louvain.² J'espère, que pour le bien de l'œuvre, ce bon Monsieur et savant professeur se décidera à publier son opinion. Je vais le lui demander.

LOUVAIN, 12 décembre 1894.

J'ai lu avec vif intérêt l'étude sur les Ordinations anglicanes de Fernand Dalbus, que j'ai l'honneur de vous retourner par le même courrier. Le problème y est discuté comme il convient, non pas dans un esprit d'hostilité ridicule contre les anglicans, mais suivant une méthode et avec un sens vraiment scientifique. C'est une excellente dissertation. Je ne puis, cependant, partager la conclusion de l'auteur. Ce qu'il dit de l'intention ne m'a nullement convaincu. Quant au décret *ad Armenos*, bien qu'il rejette, avec raison, l'opinion de ceux qui prétendent qu'Eugène IV. n'a pas seulement voulu exposer les rites qui manquaient aux Arméniens, je crois qu'il donne à ce décret une portée qu'il n'a absolument pas. Pour moi, après avoir lu attentivement la brochure de Fernand Dalbus, j'arrive à conclure qu'il est, en théorie, extrêmement probable, sinon certain, que les Ordinations anglicanes sont valides.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

Janvier 1895.

Ci-joint la première³ lettre de l'archevêque de Cantorbéry, la seconde lettre⁴ de l'archevêque, le projet de lettre qu'il me semble que le Pape pourrait écrire aux évêques anglais, un mémoire que je viens de rédiger, et dont vous pouvez vous servir en faisant votre rapport au cardinal Rampolla. C'est à peu près ce que j'ai fait dire au cardinal Vaughan qui part pour Rome lundi. Le cardinal dit qu'on va lui dire à Rome d'être plus aimable envers nous à l'avenir. Je crois que dans votre lettre au cardinal Rampolla vous pourriez donner le contenu des lettres de l'archevêque.

¹ The account of what happened in Rome, as stated in the Cardinal's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 176, appears later on.

² Van Hoonaker.

³ That of 15th October 1894, p. 137.

⁴ That of 27th October 1894, p. 141.

Nous avons fait savoir tout nettement au cardinal Vaughan qu'il a fait fausse route, et qu'il est très mal vu de notre côté. Il paraît que cela a été une surprise pour lui. Comme on se connaît peu dans ce monde ! Mais enfin, mon cher ami, ce qui est différé n'est point perdu. L'archevêque de Canterbury avait tous les atouts dans la main, il n'a pas voulu les jouer. Sans doute il est dans une position difficile, mais le cœur doit avoir ses raisons, et elles valent dans certaines choses toutes celles qui viennent de la tête. Ce qui est agaçant, c'est qu'ici la tête et le cœur disaient la même chose. J'ai essayé d'avoir une troisième lettre, mais quoique l'archevêque d'York ait fait de son mieux pour obtenir qu'elle fût écrite, il a échoué. Il serait très injuste de rejeter toute la responsabilité pour le manque de cœur de notre archevêque, sur le dos du cardinal Vaughan, mais il est très vrai que ce dernier y est pour beaucoup.

Ce qui est à désirer, c'est qu'à Rome on entende tout ce que le cardinal Vaughan veut dire, qu'on se renseigne le plus possible, mais qu'on diffère toute action pour le moment. Un délai n'a d'ailleurs pas d'inconvénients, je crois même que c'est un avantage. Je partirai pour Rome vers le 20 février, et d'ici là nous allons un peu remuer l'esprit public ; l'association pour la ré-union de la chrétienté, dont je vous ai parlé, va aussi adresser une lettre au Pape.

The Abbé preferred the Archbishop of Canterbury's original letter which, with letters from other English bishops, was later on given to the Pope. About the same time Mr. Ward, in reply to a letter of mine telling him of Mr. Athelstan Riley's interview with Cardinal Vaughan, asked that a copy of Mr. Riley's letter and Memorandum should be sent to the Duke of Norfolk. 'I do not,' Mr. Ward said, 'entirely agree with Riley's Memorandum, but I do with much of it. Also, I did not think that your drafted letter, as it stands, could be adopted, *e.g.* its phraseology about Eastern and Western Churches. Of course we look upon the Russian and Greek Churches as not part of the visible Church.'¹

¹ This statement illustrates what I allude to later on, that subjection to an external authority, specifically Communion with Rome, is what Roman Catholics have in view when they speak of membership in the Church, rather than the profession of the Catholic faith and the possession of valid Sacraments, *i.e.* those means of grace by which the Incarnation is extended to us, and we are made by sacramental union members of Christ's Body. See p. 399.

Though their heresy (denial of Papal Infallibility) may not be as serious as that of the Monophysites or Donatists, their position is the same from our point of view. The Pope must, of course, use no phrase inconsistent with this position. Though he need not emphasise it.'

CHAPTER VII

ADDRESS ON REUNION DELIVERED AT BRISTOL BY LORD HALIFAX,
14TH FEBRUARY 1895—LETTERS OF ENGLISH BISHOPS.

THE year 1895 continued the correspondence begun in 1894. Cardinal Vaughan had reached Rome on the 19th of January, and was followed by Abbot Gasquet on the 31st. I was in possession of the reply from the Archbishop of Canterbury in response to Cardinal Rampolla's letter to the Abbé Portal, and was preparing to go to Rome myself, but before doing so was arranging to deliver an address on the subject of Reunion at Leeds and Bristol, which I hoped would elicit further expressions of sympathy with the cause of reunion, and would have the effect of showing how gladly, in the interests of such reunion, proposals for conferences on disputed points of doctrine would be welcomed in England.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

1 février 1895.

Le Monde d'aujourd'hui donne la dépêche suivante : 'Le Saint Père fera venir à Rome les trois évêques anglais de Salford, de Nottingham et de Southwark pour les entretenir, après le cardinal Vaughan, sur les applications de la lettre apostolique *Praeclara* à l'Eglise anglicane. On assure que la *Civiltà cattolica* consacrera une étude approfondie à la question de la validité des Ordinations anglicanes.'

L'Univers annonce que le cardinal Vaughan passera à Rome tout le mois de février. J'écrirai sous peu à M. Lorin pour lui demander si nous pouvons compter sur lui. Il faut, de toute nécessité, qu'il se trouve à Rome avec vous, ou que moi j'y sois. Vous avez absolument besoin de l'un de nous deux. Dans les circonstances actuelles, si besoin était, mes supérieurs ne feraient

aucune difficulté de me permettre de m'absenter 15 jours, ou même un mois. La dépêche du *Monde* prouve que le cardinal n'a pas enlevé la situation d'un coup de main, comme il avait l'air de s'y attendre. Connaissez-vous ces trois évêques ?

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

5 février 1895.

Ce que vous m'envoyez sur le voyage de ces évêques a paru, à peu près, dans nos journaux. Il y en a d'autres aussi qui ont semblé dire que le Pape ne se résignait pas aux idées exprimées par le cardinal qui ne pensait qu'à des soumissions individuelles, et qu'il voulait s'éclairer en cherchant d'autres informations. Il doit y avoir du vrai dans tout cela. Ainsi, dites-bien à M. Lorin que l'important pour le moment, c'est de ne rien décider. Lady Halifax, la petite, ou plutôt la grande Agnès¹ qu'elle est devenue, et moi, nous partirons pour Rome le 24 ou le 25 et nous y serons pour un mois. Si j'ai l'occasion, je parlerai avec la plus grande franchise et à cœur ouvert au Saint Père, et je tâcherai de lui faire comprendre que le nœud de la situation chez nous c'est de mettre l'opinion publique de notre côté. C'est la peur de cette opinion qui est la vraie source de nos difficultés.

Vous l'aviez bien vu, n'est-ce pas, chez l'archevêque de Canterbury ? Chez nos évêques il y a aussi l'impossibilité de croire qu'aucune démarche amicale de la part de Rome soit possible. Chez les vôtres, en dehors des difficultés qu'ils constatent dans l'état actuel de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, il y a peur aussi de mettre en danger les avantages de la situation actuelle pour eux, où personne ne leur dit rien—par une démarche du Pape qui pourrait être mal prise par l'esprit public chez nous.² De chaque côté il y a peur de s'aventurer, et c'est pourquoi je dis que le nœud de la situation est dans l'esprit public.

Je crois qu'il est nécessaire de chaque côté que les simples soldats poussent un peu les officiers en avant.

Comment influencer sur l'esprit public ? Voilà la question. Pour ceci il m'est clair que le Pape est dans la position de faire plus que personne, et qu'il ne dépend que de lui de pousser cette opinion dans la bonne voie. Une lettre du Pape, telle que celle

¹ My second daughter, married in 1903 to George Richard Lane-Fox.

² See extract of letter, Duke of Norfolk to Mr. Wilfrid Ward, dated 2nd December 1894, footnote, p. 159.

dont je vous ai envoyé le projet, non seulement est la meilleure chose, mais la seule chose à faire à ce moment.

J'étais à Leeds hier au soir, où j'ai donné une conférence sur la réunion des Eglises. Le curé de Leeds présidait et il y avait beaucoup de membres du clergé, de toutes les nuances d'opinion. Je ne leur ai rien épargné. Vous-même, vous n'auriez pas pu dire mieux sur l'unité, sur Rome, sur le Pape, etc., etc. C'était très long. Il y avait dans le discours d'autres choses, comme la nécessité de ramener à l'unité les dissidents parmi nous. Tout cela a été très bien reçu, et je suis maintenant en train de le faire imprimer. Aussitôt fini, je vous en enverrai un exemplaire. Je crois que si vous le lisiez avec M. Brunet ¹ et que vous en fassiez une traduction de certaines parties pour le cardinal Rampolla, cela pourrait être utile.

Je dois parler dans le même sens à Bristol, où il y aura beaucoup de personnes animées des mêmes sentiments.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

12 février 1895.

Hier j'ai écrit à M. Lorin pour lui annoncer votre départ et votre intention de passer un mois à Rome. Je lui dis que nous comptons sur son influence et je le prie de me faire savoir s'il pourra se trouver à Rome. Quant à moi, mon cher ami, vous ne doutez pas du vrai bonheur que j'aurais à me trouver à Rome avec vous. Qu'il ferait bon visiter ensemble les Eglises, nos vieux sanctuaires, nos catacombes, nos communes origines et prier ensemble auprès de la confession des Apôtres. Il ferait bon aussi revoir ensemble les œuvres d'art innombrables et les beaux monuments païens. Et puis quelles délicieuses causeries au Pincio, à St. Pierre in Montorio, dont j'aime tant la belle vue sur la ville. Ce serait bon, au-delà du possible, car ce serait une fête perpétuelle pour l'esprit, la piété et pour nos cœurs d'amis. Mais ce bonheur est un luxe pour un Lazariste, et je ne puis me le promettre. Si mon voyage était nécessaire ou sérieusement utile je n'hésiterais pas une minute, et je suis convaincu que je n'éprouverais pas la moindre difficulté de la part de mes supérieurs. Vous verrez, mon cher ami, et cette fois ce sera à vous à juger et à prendre des responsabilités. Chacun son tour. En tout cas, il est bien inutile que je sois avec vous dès les premiers jours.

¹ A friend of the Abbé Portal, who had lived much in England, and understood English perfectly.

Lord Halifax to Mr. Wilfrid Ward

79 EATON SQUARE, S.W.,

February 15, 1895.

My Address¹ is, I believe, printed *in extenso* in the *Church Times*. I shall be glad if you will wade through it. It was extremely well received at Bristol last night, at a very large meeting. It is a good deal curtailed in the Bristol papers, but I send you the account of the meeting as it appears in them. Let me have it again. You are quite wrong if you think people don't care for unity.² They do care very much. It is only that so much that is put forward by those who write most in the papers on the subject makes them feel hopeless.

I have shown the paragraph you helped me with, *in re* the Vatican Council, to several people, and they were very favourably impressed by it.³

In that address I spoke of the unity of the Church, and of that unity I said Rome was the symbol and centre; that Canterbury was the daughter of Rome, that it was to Rome, as the seat of the Bishop, the authority of whose See was acknowledged by all the Churches of the West, that the eyes of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers turned for help. That there was a long way from such requests for help and assistance to the centralisation which later on developed itself in the Western Church, required no insisting upon. On the other hand, when for controversial purposes it was attempted to discover an origin for the English Church other than that of Rome, or to prove that England from the earliest times was not united to Rome by the closest

¹ Address delivered at Bristol, 14th February 1895.

² Mr. Ward, in a previous letter, had insisted how few people in England, even members of the Church of England, cared for unity, or were anxious for reunion.

³ 'If by Papal infallibility it is only meant that the Pope is infallible when acting as the head of the whole Church, and expressing the mind of the Church, and after taking all the legitimate and usual means for ascertaining that mind, in determining which the authority and witness of the bishops, as representing their respective churches, must be paramount, and then only in regard to the substance of the deposit handed down from Christ and His Apostles, it would seem that the difficulty of a possible agreement is not so insuperable as it has been sometimes represented.'

links of an external unity and the bond of a common faith, the only result was to tempt those who were acquainted with the facts to doubt either our honesty, or at least the trustworthiness of our historical methods; that if Elizabeth had been treated by the Court of Rome, as Leo XIII. had treated the French Republic, there could be little doubt that the ecclesiastical history of England would have been very different; that since the separation of the sixteenth century there has constantly been a yearning for reunion; that this desire might almost be said to supply the keynote to the writings of such men as Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Montagu, Archbishop Laud, Archbishop Bramhall, and others; that more recently in a letter addressed to the father of the late Lord Ripon by Bishop Doyle, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the Bishop had said that 'a union of the Churches was not so difficult as it might appear to many; . . . that there would be no great difficulty in reconciling the doctrinal decisions of the Council of Trent with the Anglican Articles'; and that Archbishop Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in a subsequent letter, had not shrunk from saying that 'were Church of England people true to the principles laid down in their Prayer Book, the doctrinal differences, which appear considerable, but are not, would soon be removed.' Cardinal Wiseman's letter to Lord Shrewsbury had later on taken a not very dissimilar line. No doubt, I said, there were difficulties on every side, and I should be the last to ignore them. We had frankly to admit that whatever the theoretical claims of the Church of England might be, there was much in her actual condition to damp our hopes. Could we forget the conflicting parties within her communion? Could we ignore the fact that men of the most contradictory opinions were promoted to the highest offices of the Church? Nothing could be more disastrous than to ignore such facts. We must freely admit that there was great truth in the objection that even if the Roman authorities were willing to commence negotiations for peace, there would remain the divisions in the Anglican Church, and the hostility of large

sections of English feeling to be taken into account, but that all this was no reason for not doing all in our power to leaven public opinion, for not striving to dispel prejudice, or for not endeavouring by mutual explanations to prepare the way for the reunion of both sides in the acknowledgment of the same truth : that, just as it was not fair to judge the Roman Catholic Church by abuses which at various times had disfigured its communion, so neither was it fair to impute to the Church of England the blame of opinions diametrically opposed to its authoritative formularies, and that no one who knew anything of the history of the Church of England, especially during the last sixty years, could doubt that the difficulties in the way of reunion above alluded to were essentially temporary and accidental, or that a generous view of the position of the Church of England was not really the true one.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

MOLESCROFT, EASTBOURNE,

February 20, 1895.

I hope soon to write at length, but I must not longer delay saying that I read your speech with the greatest interest. If I may say so, it seems to me very remarkable in its breadth of sympathy and the power it shows of seeing many points of view. I agree with most, though not all of it, and even if I feel reunion to be much further from 'practical politics' than you do, I can't doubt that the speech will tend to promote a better understanding, and to enable us to work together.

What I particularly want to know is, how far your words will provoke hostile comment. Much turns on that. I think it was very bold of you to say what you did. I hope that it will really help towards making the whole question actual.

I don't deny that a good many have a vague wish for unity ; what I feel is that few have your sort of feeling that the Church of England is in a false position in its isolation—and nothing short of this will give a chance of any practicable scheme amid so many difficulties.

A competent Roman Catholic critic, who does not know that I know you, writes calling my attention to your 'large-minded' address.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

Février 1895.

Voici mon discours¹ au grand complet. Il était impossible pour des raisons que vous comprendrez tout de suite, de le raccourcir, les parties visant nos dissidents et l'Eglise presbytérienne établie en Ecosse étaient nécessaires pour m'assurer certaines sympathies, et pour éviter le reproche que je ne traitais qu'un côté de la question. J'ai montré le paragraphe au sujet du Concile du Vatican à M. Ward qui a ajouté quelques mots. J'espère que ce paragraphe fera du bien. Ai-je profité de vos enseignements ? J'ai une lettre du cardinal² ce matin ; il m'écrit qu'il a dit toutes sortes d'aimables choses sur mon compte au Saint Père, et que le Pape sera content de causer avec moi, et que lui, le cardinal, fera tout ce qu'il pourra en conscience pour m'aider. Il ajoute que pour le moment ses espérances se fondent plutôt sur les conversions individuelles que sur la réunion en corps des églises séparées. Elle fait des progrès, cette Eminence !

J'espère avoir d'autres lettres de nos évêques donnant expression à des sentiments sur la question de la réunion tels que nous pouvons les désirer. On me fait beaucoup de compliments sur mon discours ; je ne vous le dis pas par esprit de vanité, mais parce que cela peut avoir une certaine importance.

Nous partons de lundi en huit. Oui, oui, oui, mon cher ami, vous viendrez à Rome. Soignez-vous bien. Moi, j'ai des rhumatismes aux reins, et suis absolument cloué sur mon fauteuil. Je vous écrirai avant de partir.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

22 février 1895.

Voici ma dernière lettre que vous recevrez en Angleterre avant de partir pour Rome. Je n'ai, mon cher ami, au-dessus de tout, qu'à vous offrir des vœux pour votre voyage. Lady Halifax sera bien heureuse de vous accompagner et de suivre minute par minute le développement et l'issue d'une affaire dont son âme pieuse comprend toute l'importance. Heureux voyage pour vous deux et pour votre chère Agnès, et surtout que là-bas Notre Seigneur bénisse vos paroles et vos efforts !

¹ Speech at Bristol, 14th February 1895.² Cardinal Vaughan.

Je l'en prierai de tout mon cœur. Si de corps je reste ici toute mon âme sera avec vous.

Votre discours,¹ mon cher ami, est bien ce qu'il devait être. Il constitue le premier acte public de notre mouvement, et de la façon la plus heureuse. Encore une semence que le bon Dieu bénira, soyez en sûr.

Il me tarde, au-delà de tout ce que je puis dire, que vous soyez à Rome. Nos journaux annoncent une prochaine solution de la question de vos Ordres. Hier, le *Monde* contenait une dépêche incompréhensible, 'On annonce une prochaine solution dans le sens indiqué par Dalbus, cette solution serait donnée sur la demande d'un évêque anglais.'

The Address, to which reference has been made in the preceding letters, was delivered at Bristol on the 14th of February 1895, with the object of eliciting an expression of opinion in favour of reunion, and in the hope that it might prepare the way for such conferences on disputed points as the Abbé Portal and I had contemplated from the beginning. In both respects it fulfilled its purpose. The response it elicited not only witnessed to the desire for reunion, but to the favour with which proposals for conferences for the purpose of mutual explanation would be received. I give some extracts from these letters, which were afterwards presented to the Pope.

From Canon Scott Holland : ²—

I must thank you from my heart for that great and beautiful utterance ; in tone and temper, in sympathy and tolerance, you will forgive me if I think it perfect.

From the Rev. John Sharpe : ³—

I cannot help writing to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your speech on the question of unity. It is wonderful to think that such an outspoken statement of truth should be possible in our day, and I am more thankful to God and to you than words can express. How would such an utterance have

¹ Speech at Bristol, 14th February 1895.

² Canon of St. Paul's, since Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

³ Called the 'Kebble of the North,' for sixty years the Incumbent of Horbury, near Wakefield, and the leading member of the Catholic party in the Church of England, north of Trent.

been treated fifty years ago? Nothing can show more clearly the length of journey that we have travelled than that it should be possible to utter it now! What a hope it is for the English Church, and for all Christendom. We are all here full of prayers for the result. Of course there will be much misconception and evil speaking, but there is a power in truth which is of God, and cannot be resisted, and thousands will be praying that it may prevail.

From the Bishop of Chester (Rt. Rev. Francis John Jayne):—

Your paper has been read, and, for the most part, re-read, with profound sympathy, and (if I may say so), admiration. The Corporate Reunion of Christendom is an object towards which every true Christian heart must yearn.

In another letter the Bishop added:—

I feel sure there would be a full-hearted disposition to meet an invitation which would involve no disloyalty to our own Church, and her destiny as a—perhaps the—chief instrument in God's hands for healing the wounds of Christendom.

From the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Rt. Rev. Charles John Ellicott):—

What am I to say? That your address may have issues in the future (especially if the Pope should decide in favour of the Orders of the Church of England) far beyond what can now be foreseen.

From the Bishop of St. Albans (Rt. Rev. John Wogan Festing):—

The idea of the Church united, while tolerating certain differences between the various parts, is a glorious vision. And though one's heart fails as one contemplates even only some of the difficulties in the way, yet it is indeed something to have the idea held up in this way, and in such a spirit.

From the Bishop of Wakefield (Rt. Rev. William Walsham How):—

I long and pray for the reunion of Christendom. Were all agreed in fervently desiring the end, God would surely show the way.

From the Bishop of Truro (Rt. Rev. John Gott) :—

Reunion of Christendom has been my prayer and hope for most of my grown-up life.

From the Bishop of Brechin (Most Rev. Hugh Willoughby Jermyn) :—

I agree with your subject most heartily. Old as I am, I have a distinct recollection of my father enunciating much the same views you are now pressing so effectually, when I was a child.

From the Bishop of Lincoln (Rt. Rev. Edward King) :—

I have read your speech with the greatest interest, and thank you heartily for it . . . anything and everything that we can do to heal the divisions of Western Christianity must be our nearest and immediate duty. At the same time we must not forget that real corporate union must be on truth which will unite East as well as West, and the great Far East of India, Japan, and China, when they accept the faith. May God be with you, and protect you on your journey, and fulfil your heart's desire according to the mind of the Holy Spirit even beyond what you ask or think.

From the Bishop of Moray and Ross (Rt. Rev. James Butler Knill Kelly) :—

Thank you for sending a copy of your great speech . . . surely it must be the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church which is leading men everywhere to pray and strive for unity at a time when the forces of unbelief and sin are marshalling themselves for what may prove to be the last and greatest conflict which shall usher in the second Coming of the Son of Man.

From the Bishop of Argyll (Rt. Rev. James Robert Alexander Chinnery Haldane) :—

I have read your speech with great interest and sympathy. I do indeed long for an end to be put to our present isolation. But, as I have my hopes, so I have my fears . . . it seems to me more than likely that those who do not wish us well are now working matters with a view to obtaining, after a so-called exhaustive and impartial examination of Anglican Orders, an authoritative denial of their validity.

The Bishop of Peterborough's (Rt. Rev. Mandell Creighton) reply I give in full :—

Your letter with enclosures are most interesting to me, and give much food for meditation. The practical question in all such matters is—Who is to begin ? That is the great difficulty in all great reforms, the first step must be made—by whom ? Now, on the immediate question, the validity of Anglican Orders, I can see the Archbishop's reasons for hesitating. The attitude of Cardinal Vaughan has been very aggressive and exasperating. It is impossible to admit that the Church of England is on trial, or asks for any recognition. There is no doubt amongst us of the validity of our Orders : we are quite satisfied. Roman theologians have denied it, and have thereby made the breach. If they thought fit to take any steps to heal it, the effect would doubtless be great. The restoration of the unity of Christendom will be, not by affirming any one of the existing systems as universal, but by a federation. What we have to do is to sweep away foolish and one-sided controversy, and seek 'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' Natural differences, the sense of individual liberty, habits and modes of thought are too strong to be set aside. But there is no real reason why these should not be accommodated in one system, which admits of gradations. In the mediæval Church, for instance, the Franciscans were at first something like the Salvation Army—only *they denied nothing*, and did not profess that their way was the only way. The mediæval Church was very liberal to those who were only positive, and not negative. Men might be as simple as they chose in their beliefs, and in their practice, but it was not for them to object to what the Church had once allowed. Now, some such conception as this must be at the bottom of reunion ; we do not differ—any Christians—about the contents of the Christian faith, but about the proportion of them and the means of their application to the individual soul. The real point of difference is about the means. Well, if some one says to me, 'I find such and such means good for me,' even though they seem to me complicated, and in some ways unreasonable, why should I object ? If another says : 'I do not find your means useful to me, and I want something more direct and more personal and simpler,' I must, on the same grounds, put up with him. If these various methods were put side by side, were allowed to work as parts of one system, the best would slowly make their power felt and approve themselves. But at

present Nonconformists do not discover their poverty ; the Romans do not discover their want of contact with actual life. That is their real defect. They are upholding a system, not making it operative on life : greater knowledge of our Church would help them greatly in this, and we need to know something of the greater versatility and adaptability of their methods.

This is becoming a discourse. Let me sum up by saying that if any recognition of our position were given by the Pope, it would be of enormous use ; but we cannot ask for it, or seem to ask for it, without putting ourselves in the wrong. We have done nothing to invalidate our Orders ; Rome has wantonly denied them in the past, we, at our worst, have never unchurched Rome ; latterly we have been almost too kind to her.

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt. Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson)¹ wrote :—

. . . I was greatly interested in your Address. It is of real importance that such a scholar as the Abbé Duchesne should adopt and make public the view he now evidently holds respecting the validity of English Orders. . . . We ought, I think, to do everything to show our readiness to welcome any desire on the part of Rome to examine without prejudice and with absolute honesty a question upon which she has so long been giving to her children erroneous teaching. I have lately had an opportunity of inquiring in detail as to the teaching given by theological professors at Rome to a candidate for Holy Orders. After going through many years of training, both in Scotland and at Rome, he has decided that he cannot accept the Roman position, and has sought Anglican Orders instead. His account of the teaching he has received, and the evidence given by his note-books, is certainly remarkable. It seems perfectly clear that the 'Nag's Head' fable is at this very hour being taught by recognised theological professors as a fact of history, and there is much other teaching of a similar sort. Most cordially, therefore, ought we, as it seems to me, to welcome any such new departure on the part of the Roman authorities as is implied in the institution of a really genuine inquiry into the history and character of English Orders. It is obviously not for me to say what answer you ought to give were such a question asked of you as you think possible, or probable, respecting the reception

¹ Afterwards Bishop of Winchester and Archbishop of Canterbury.

such a request on the Pope's part would meet with.¹ One would need to see or hear the question before giving a reply, but, so far as my own opinion goes, I should have no hesitation in welcoming, and aiding to the uttermost, any genuine endeavour on the part of the Vatican to obtain better information than it now perhaps possesses (or accepts) as to the events of the sixteenth century. . . . It would, however, be essential for an English theologian to make clear, before he consented to co-operate in such an inquiry, that he was not in any way regarding the validity of English Orders as an open question, or placing himself in a position which could be construed as involving the duty of abiding by the decision of such inquirers should they decide or declare that English Orders are, in their opinion, less valid or regular than those of Rome. . . .

The Archbishop of York expressed his warmest 'sympathy' with the object I had in view. 'It would be difficult to understand,' he said, 'how any member of the Church, and specially any of its bishops, could fail to be animated by the strongest desire and longing for reunion. There is nothing which I have more deeply at heart, for I feel how rich in blessing it would be to the whole Catholic Church. . . . There must, of course, be considerable divergence of opinion both as to the prospects of reunion and as to the conditions under which it might be accomplished. There are also, no doubt, many difficulties of a grave character, as regards both Doctrine and Order, which it will not be easy to overcome. But our duty is to hope and not to despair, and to welcome every effort which may be made on one side or the other towards attaining the longed-for blessing, and open the way for some kind of conference.' The Archbishop went on to repeat what he had said to the Abbé Portal at Bishopthorpe, how 'touched and impressed he had been by the Encyclical letter of the Pope,' and 'how much the letters of the Abbé Duchesne strengthened the happy hope of, at least, a better understanding between the Church of Rome and the Anglican Communion.' He added, 'I cannot say what would be the feeling of the English

¹ For conferences between English and Roman theologians on disputed points of doctrine.

Episcopate generally, but for myself I should welcome with all my heart any proposal for a conference.

‘Be assured of my prayers for a special blessing on your efforts in this holy cause, and for wisdom and grace to guide you at every step.’

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in reply to my letter asking what his attitude would be in the event of any proposal for conferences on disputed points, said :—

I believe you really know how I sympathise with the far-off desire and hope of the unity of Christendom ; but it would be impossible for me to frame and approve any answer to a question which has not yet been asked. . . . Neither could I give the most capable and trusted person leave to give to any supposed question replies on my behalf in any specific direction. This would be constituting a delegacy, which I certainly should not think of doing, however great my confidence. You, however, know something at least of my views, and the strength of them, as to the gain which would accrue to Christendom if the Church of Rome would take pains to understand the history and principles of the Church of England, and you are able to judge of what would be our attitude towards any genuine and gracious attempt to understand the facts of our position. To extend their study and knowledge of these points would be productive only of good ; and as it must precede any action of any sort, it must be welcomed by any one and every one who ‘loves the truth and peace.’

Many others, both clergy and laity, wrote sympathising with the object of my Address : amongst the latter, Lady Gwendolen Cecil.¹ ‘To dwell,’ she said, ‘upon the thought of the reunion of Christendom was to desire it so passionately that she hardly dared to allow herself to do so.’

The Abbé Duchesne was also good enough to thank me for my address, adding :—

Plaise à Dieu que le bon sens et le véritable esprit chrétien viennent à bout de ces misérables schismes. Le livre² de M. Lacey fera, je n’en doute pas, beaucoup de bien. Je pense

¹ Daughter of Robert Arthur Talbot, third Marquis of Salisbury, K.C., for so long Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister.

² *De Hierarchia Anglicana.*

qu'on se sera empressé de le faire parvenir là où il doit produire son effet. Votre séjour à Rome ne sera pas de moindre conséquence. Il est à désirer qu'il ne soit pas trop différé. J'entends dire que le digne cardinal Vaughan et ses conseillers se donnent beaucoup de mouvement pour ce qu'ils croient, hélas ! être une bonne cause. Mais j'espère toujours dans la haute intelligence et le grand cœur de Léon XIII.

H. E. Cardinal Vaughan to Lord Halifax

COLLEGIO INGLESE,
ROME, February 1895.

I have given your speech,¹ which I thank you for sending to me, to Cardinal Rampolla, and the Holy Father has already read a portion of it. The *Church Times* has greatly modified its attitude.

I should much like you to consider this question. *If there be but one Church of Christ, and that the Roman, what is to become of all those individuals elsewhere, e.g., in the Church of England, who are waiting—in this supposition in heresy and schism—until the corporate reunion is brought about? How many generations of them will be born and die before the accomplishment of what you are praying for? Think well over this, and tell me when we meet here what your answer to this, my difficulty, is.*

The Rev. T. A. Lacey to Lord Halifax

MADINGLEY VICARAGE,
CAMBRIDGE, February 26, 1895.

I think you will be interested in the enclosed letter from Duchesne.

I think the best practical reply to Cardinal Vaughan's question² is another question.

Granting that every Church ought to be in union with Rome as the centre, can you maintain that practical separation is a sin which deprives the separated of grace in the use of the Sacraments, or otherwise? And if you do assert this, how do you account for the fact that for many centuries nearly one half of the whole Church has gone on in such separation, has maintained the Faith and endured much persecution, has not died

¹ Speech at Bristol.

² See preceding letter from Cardinal Vaughan, which I had shown to Mr. Lacey.

away in atrophy, but shows great vigour and power of growth? In other words, the Russian Church (to say nothing of the Anglican) is a phenomenon which remains to be accounted for on the Ultramontane hypothesis.

Of course the Cardinal's way of putting the question, 'Only one Church of Christ and that the Roman,' is inaccurate in point of form on any hypothesis, and is question-begging beyond what he apparently intends.

What our friends on the other side seem slow to realise is that we can heartily recognise the existing state of things as wrong, while maintaining that no *reatus peccati* attaches to any individual implicated therein, and that no individual can by any act separately detach himself, so to say, from that state of things.

An illustration of our attitude towards the Holy See comes ready to hand in the pages of the *Tablet*. On p. 163 is a letter from Grosseteste to Innocent IV., which the *Tablet* regards as a model of address from a bishop to the Holy Father.

Well, any one of our thorough friends, if raised to the Anglican Episcopate, could *ex animo* use the same language to the Holy Father, without abating one jot of his 'Anglicanism,' and if he met with a rebuff, no doubt he would bear it patiently and pray for better things.

It was hopelessly wrong that at Antioch, after the Arian troubles, there were two rival bodies of Catholics, the Meletians and Eustathians, with rival successions of bishops. But the Church passed no judgment of sin upon individual members of either party. Bishops of both successions are venerated among the saints, and when at last the schism was healed, it was agreed that the survivor of the two rival bishops should be sole bishop of the city. Perhaps, after all, this precedent affords the best answer to Cardinal Vaughan's question about corporate reunion.

(Enclosure)

The Abbé Duchesne to Rev. T. A. Lacey

86 RUE BONAPARTE, 25 février 1895.

C'est avec le plus grand plaisir que j'ai reçu votre dissertation sur la hiérarchie anglicane.

La thèse que vous défendez me paraît incontestable. Je m'étais déjà prononcé en ce sens dans le *Bulletin Critique*; depuis, ayant eu l'occasion d'étudier le sujet de plus près, et

notamment d'approfondir le livre d'Estcourt,¹ je n'ai fait que me confirmer dans ma première impression. Les arguties de vos adversaires ressemblent étrangement à celles qui servaient aux Donatistes pour se défendre contre les Catholiques. J'ai eu l'opportunité de développer mon opinion en très haut lieu, et je crois savoir que l'on ne m'a pas su mauvais gré de penser comme je le fais. Sans entrer dans le détail de votre livre, je crois devoir vous dire que sa principale nouveauté et son utilité la plus claire, c'est qu'il est en latin. La Cour de Rome ne sait pas l'anglais ; elle n'est informée de vos affaires que par un petit nombre de truchements, qui, autant que je les connais, sont loin d'avoir l'esprit très ouvert. En latin vous serez lus ; en anglais vous seriez interprétés.

Je puis vous dire que mon collègue, Mgr. Gasparri a tout-à-fait abandonné l'opinion émise par lui dans son traité de l'Ordination. Il s'en était rapporté à Perrone, qui l'avait trompé. Depuis, il a pris connaissance des documents, et même de vos épreuves.² En suite de cela, il a fait savoir en bon lieu qu'il était de votre avis, et il a donné les raisons de son changement.

Que Dieu veuille tracer, au milieu de ces études, et de ces controverses, un sentier qui nous conduise à l'unité, ou du moins nous en rapproche autant que possible. Soyez sûr que de mon côté, je ferai tout mon possible pour que l'on vous apprécie suivant vos mérites, ce qui arrivera si l'on parvient à vous mieux connaître.

¹ Canon Estcourt on English Orders.

² Of the *De Hierarchia Anglicana*.

CHAPTER VIII

VISIT TO ROME—AUDIENCE WITH LEO XIII.—LETTER OF LEO XIII.

Ad Anglos—ITS RECEPTION IN ENGLAND—LETTER FROM CONSTANTINE POBIÉDONOSTZEFF (CHIEF PROCURATOR OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD) TO MR. W. J. BIRKBECK.

I ARRIVED in Rome, meeting Mr. Birkbeck at Pisa, on the 12th March, being joined by Lady Halifax and my daughter a day or two later. M. Lorin, who was intimate with Cardinal Rampolla, had given me a list of persons upon whom he suggested I should call, among them Mgr. Mourey, Auditor of the Rota for French affairs. I found Cardinal Vaughan at the English College, where he had been since the beginning of January, and Dom Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop,¹ with the Benedictines at Sant' Anselmo in the Bocca di Leone.

Writing to the Abbé Portal on the 13th March, the day after my arrival, I tell him that I had been to the Vatican, but that Cardinal Rampolla was ill and not likely to be able to see us for a day or two; that I had seen Cardinal Vaughan, who had been very gracious, and told me that he had had my speech² translated into French for the Pope: that I doubted, from what I heard, whether the views I supposed him to have expressed were acceptable at the Vatican, and whether he was completely informed of what was going on: that I had seen Mgr. Mourey, and, comparing him with the Cardinal, the difference seemed to be that between a rapier and a club: that Mgr. Mourey advised his (the Abbé's) coming to Rome, which I myself felt to be absolutely necessary. The Abbé in consequence arrived a little later, staying, while in Rome, at the Lazarist House in the via della Croce.

¹ So well known for his knowledge of Liturgies.

² At Bristol.

Meanwhile, all that I heard in Rome witnessed to the interest taken in our affairs: the question of English Orders and the possibility of reunion seemed to be the general topic of conversation. It was, however, no secret that the action of the Abbé Portal and the Articles of the Abbé Duchesne were a source of irritation to many of the English Roman Catholics.

The attitude of Cardinal Vaughan and Dom Gasquet, which was one of absolute hostility to all that the Abbé Portal and I were attempting, was proof of this. They entirely ignored that there was a Catholic side to the history of the Church of England, they repudiated the claims made on behalf of that Church by the Oxford Movement; they did not understand them, it was a provocation to see them brought forward, and a still greater provocation to see them brought forward by foreigners, whose intervention in English affairs they resented, and whose interference they thought could lead to nothing but mischief.

It was represented to the Pope that there was no real desire for reunion in England, that such persons as myself represented but a very small fraction of the members of the Church of England, and even this fraction did not believe in the authority of the Church, but were actuated by a desire rather to strengthen their own position by obtaining some recognition of their Orders, than to renew the ancient relations that had bound England to Rome. The Abbé Portal's action had already had the effect of stopping conversions; if the Roman Church after its practice of so many years were to alter its conduct, and thus practically admit that it had been mistaken in one thing, the inference would at once be drawn that it might be mistaken in others. Nothing, therefore, could be more unfortunate than to reopen the question of the validity of English Orders on any supposed ground of expediency, but if it were to be reopened at all it should only be after a full inquiry, assisted by those who were most competent to give advice on the subject,¹ with a statement of the reasons for reaffirm-

¹ *i.e.*, Englishmen. Dom Gasquet, who was then in Rome with Mr. Edmund Bishop, had been sent there for that purpose.

ing the invalidity of those Orders. Further, that nothing could be more disastrous than for the Pope to address a direct communication to the English bishops.¹

The reasons which had actuated the conduct of the Abbé Portal and myself were, in fact, completely ignored and misrepresented. The question of Orders had been with us from the beginning not an end, but a means, and, as we believed, the only available and most effectual means at our disposal for making an approach to Rome possible. No doubt the difficulties in the way of such an approach were great. It was also true that such individuals as myself represented only a fraction of the English Church, and that it was our obvious duty to see that the Pope had no illusions on that score. In all this Cardinal Vaughan and those he represented were clearly in the right. Where they were in the wrong was in persistently ignoring the reason why the Orders question had been taken up, and in refusing to see that it had been approached merely as a means to facilitate the acceptance of conferences in which the obstacles to reunion could be discussed, and in order to promote such a change in the traditional attitude of England towards Rome, as all admitted to be necessary if reunion was to become a practical question. It ought surely to have been the Cardinal's desire in the interests of reunion to further any steps which might promote that movement. Nothing would have done more in this direction than a change in the attitude of Rome in regard to the validity of English Orders. It was a change which

¹ In the account by Cardinal Vaughan of his interview with the Pope (*Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 177), the following passage occurs: "I told him of the effect produced already in this direction [keeping back conversions] by the report that he was going to write to the Protestant archbishops. I assured him they are anxious only to strengthen their own position, and to keep waverers from Rome; that they are all opposed to the supremacy of the Pope, and that his letter could not alter that. "Ah, then, if they are opposed to the doctrine of the authority of the Vicar of Christ, that is different. How is it they cannot see that the Church must have a head?" Finally, he said he would issue an Encyclical on the Church and her Head in the middle of this year, if he lived so long. I chimed in, "That would be excellent and if your Holiness would give two or three paragraphs of such an Encyclical to the Anglicans, kind words to them should be accompanied with the doctrines which they have yet to learn."

certainly could not be made on any mere ground of expediency, but if a complete and impartial inquiry into the circumstances of the case, historical and theological—regard being had to all that might be alleged on behalf of the Church of England—made such a change possible, then that it was a change eminently desirable in the interests of reunion could hardly be doubted. Any one desiring reunion would have wished such a change to be found possible. The Cardinal and his advisers were actuated by no such wish. From the beginning they had declared English Orders absolutely invalid, and had taken every means in their power to enforce that opinion. It was stated when I came to Rome that an attempt had been made in a quarter hostile to the Abbé Duchesne to propose theses to the Holy Office asking whether it was a safe opinion to hold the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England, and that for this purpose the Abbé Duchesne's articles in the *Bulletin Critique* and the Abbé Portal's pamphlet had been denounced to the Holy Office. Evidently such a question so put, in view of the existing practice of the Roman Church, could only be answered in one way. It must have been replied that such an opinion was not a safe one. This would, indeed, have left the question of the validity of those Orders exactly where it was, but in popular opinion it would have seemed to condemn them, and it would have had the effect of branding as 'temerarious' the opinions put forward by the Abbé Duchesne, who had many enemies in Rome,—opinions which, as will have been seen from the previous correspondence, were producing so good an impression in England. It was also stated that the Holy Office was about to give the answer desired, and it was even said that the day for the decision had been fixed. In point of fact, the attempt, owing to the intervention of Cardinal Rampolla, had already failed; but when, in ignorance of that fact, the matter came to the knowledge of Cardinal Vaughan, he strenuously opposed any such indirect condemnation of English Orders, on the ground that such a condemnation would be likely to be misunderstood, and that if the subject were approached at all it ought to be after full inquiry, and after

consultation with those in England who could inform the Roman authorities of the true facts of the case.¹

I was received by Leo XIII. on Thursday, the 21st March. The Pope spoke of the position of England in reference to St. Peter, St. Gregory and St. Augustine—of Unity—of his desire for peace and for reunion. The schism under Henry VIII. was mentioned, with a reference to 'Anna Bolena.' He said that in the event of reunion, England would have nothing to fear from the intrusion of foreigners. Afterwards the Pope encouraged me to speak. I spoke of the Abbé Portal and of his earnest desire and mine to work for reunion, of what had been done, of the opportunity the thirteenth centenary of St. Augustine's Mission to England afforded for a letter to the English bishops about to assemble at Lambeth; the inutility of any such communication to them if made through Cardinal Vaughan. Some allusion was made to general matters, including the appointment of bishops in England and the possibility of conferences on disputed points between theologians on both sides. And then, referring to the copy of the *De Hierarchia* which I had presented to the Pope, and which he had on his knee, he said he meant to look into the matter himself. Here, or later, in the course of my audience, I had the opportunity of mentioning the rumours which had been current as to

¹ See Abbot Gasquet's *Diary*, pp. 16, 17 :—

Tuesday, 12th February.—'Last evening I had heard on the best possible authority that a certain Monsignore living in Rome had sent Dalbus' pamphlet to the Holy Office, on the ground that it was doing a lot of harm in Rome by its wide circulation. This appears to me to be a most unfortunate and deplorable step, and I gave my reasons for thinking so to the Cardinal. He quite agreed; indeed it is obvious how very harmful such a thing as the condemnation at this time of the pamphlet *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, would be before the English public, which would probably credit the Cardinal himself with trying to avoid discussion. He said he would at once move "heaven and earth" to prevent any notice being taken of the denunciation.'

A comparison of this entry with that of 1st February (p. 13) shows that the denunciation to the Holy Office here spoken of refers to the same matter as that previously mentioned by Fr. Brandi of the *Civiltà Cattolica* who told Dom Gasquet on Friday, the 1st February, that certain articles he had written for that paper in reference to the pamphlet of M. Dalbus (Abbé Portal) on *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, and the review of it by M. Duchesne in the *Revue Critique*, which had been very widely distributed in ecclesiastical circles in Rome, had been ordered to be held over.

the intervention of the Holy Office, in regard to which the Pope gave me to understand that I need be under no apprehensions. I think he added, in reference to my fear that some condemnation might be imminent, that such would not be the case.

I then asked if Mr. Birkbeck might come in. He did so. There was some further conversation, the Pope gave us his blessing, and the audience was concluded.

I insert here a *Mémoire* in French, to which were appended copies of letters of English bishops,¹ which I presented to the Pope at my audience :—

MÉMOIRE

Le désir de faire quelque chose pour l'union a inspiré toute l'action de l'abbé Portal et de Lord Halifax.

C'est le seul but qu'ils se sont proposé. En face des difficultés, des ignorances, des préjugés, et des mauvaises volontés qui entravent toute tentative de cette sorte, l'important, surtout, est de s'aborder. Pour s'unir il faut se connaître. C'est la grande nécessité. Ils ont cru que les Ordres offraient le meilleur terrain pour cela, et c'est avec cette intention que l'Abbé a fait sur les ordinations anglicanes la brochure qu'on connaît.

Il est inutile de prendre note du mouvement de sympathie qui s'est produit dans la presse française, mais il est important, pour préciser la situation actuelle, de rappeler ce que l'abbé Portal s'est cru permis de dire à son retour de Rome au mois de septembre dernier (1894).

L'abbé fut reçu par le cardinal Rampolla le 11 septembre, et le 12 par le Pape. Après avoir parlé de ce qu'il avait vu en Angleterre, et de ce qu'il comprenait de l'état actuel de l'Eglise anglicane, il a été amené par le Pape lui-même à dire s'il y avait quelque chose à faire dans ce moment pour la cause de l'unité. L'abbé a répondu qu'il lui semblait qu'une lettre pouvait être adressée par le Pape aux archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York. Dans cette lettre le Pape dirait qu'il avait appris des choses très consolantes sur l'état de l'Eglise anglicane, sur le désir de l'union qui existe dans beaucoup de ses membres, et qu'il s'adresse à eux pour savoir s'il y a quelque chose à faire pour le bien de l'Eglise, et quels moyens on pourrait prendre ; les priant de travailler avec lui à l'union des chrétiens.

¹ See pp. 187-193.

La lettre devait être secrète et privée par déférence pour les archevêques, puisqu'ainsi le Pape pouvait demander conseil.

Cette démarche fut acceptée par le Pape, et par le cardinal Rampolla, et il fut même question des conférences qui pourraient être le résultat d'une telle démarche et où la question des Ordres devrait nécessairement être traitée en premier lieu. Deux jours après, il a paru plus prudent au Pape et au cardinal de ne pas faire tout d'abord cette démarche directe, mais de la faire précéder par une lettre adressée à l'abbé Portal, lui témoignant l'intérêt qu'on prenait à Rome à sa brochure, le plaisir qu'on avait à voir traiter le sujet d'une telle façon, et exprimant en outre la bonne volonté de Rome à l'égard de l'Eglise d'Angleterre et le désir de prendre contact par des conférences amicales. Cette lettre devait amener une démarche quelconque de la part de l'Eglise anglicane qui permettrait au Saint Père d'adresser la lettre directe aux archevêques.

Evidemment il était nécessaire qu'à Rome on eût quelque preuve d'une égale bonne volonté en Angleterre, et une assurance que la démarche du Pape ne serait pas repoussée.

Dans les dernières entrevues le cardinal Rampolla a dit que le Pape voulait charger l'abbé Duchesne de faire un travail sur les Ordres, et le Pape et le cardinal Rampolla ont tous deux dit combien il était important de résoudre d'abord cette question.

Une telle démarche de la part de Rome, le choix de l'abbé Duchesne, constituaient des procédés si bienveillants pour l'Eglise d'Angleterre, et démontraient un si grand désir d'envisager les choses sous le point de vue le plus favorable pour cette Eglise ; ils étaient de plus si conformes aux désirs et aux espérances de tous ceux qui en Angleterre ont cherché quels seraient les meilleurs moyens pour commencer l'œuvre de l'union si ardemment désirée par tous les cœurs chrétiens, qu'ils surpassaient toutes les espérances.

De Rome, l'abbé Portal alla tout droit en Angleterre, où il vit les archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York, et l'évêque de Lincoln, qui furent tous profondément surpris et frappés par les communications que l'abbé se croyait en état de faire sur les dispositions de l'Eglise de Rome.

Cependant l'archevêque de Cantorbéry, tout en exprimant fortement le désir de faire tout son possible pour la cause de l'union, ne dissimula pas les hésitations qu'il éprouvait. Il craignait que l'abbé Portal n'eût vu qu'un côté de l'Eglise anglicane, que Lord Halifax lui-même ne fût peut-être pas dans

la meilleure position pour juger avec une impartialité parfaite l'état des esprits en Angleterre. Il prétendait qu'il fallait se demander si Lord Halifax ne faisait pas trop peu de cas des préjugés qui existaient encore, qu'il fallait aussi se rendre compte des vraies difficultés qu'il serait nécessaire de résoudre pour réconcilier l'enseignement de l'Eglise anglicane avec la doctrine et la discipline de Rome, qu'il était surtout nécessaire dans une matière aussi délicate de regarder de très près, de quel côté, et avec quelles dispositions la masse du public en Angleterre serait portée à envisager de tels propos, qu'on devait à tout prix, dans l'intérêt de tout le monde, éviter d'exciter les préjugés religieux, qu'il serait fâcheux de risquer de nouveaux malentendus, qu'il y avait, par exemple, des expressions dans la lettre même du cardinal Rampolla qui certainement susciteraient des difficultés, et que sa position à lui, comme Primat de l'Angleterre, demandait une très grande prudence.

L'archevêque d'York, et l'évêque de Lincoln, bien qu'ils fussent d'accord sur la nécessité de ne pas augmenter les difficultés de la situation, parlèrent d'un ton plus encourageant.

Sur ces entrefaites, l'abbé Portal retourna en France. A ce moment parut le discours du cardinal Vaughan à Preston, qui semblait arrêter tout court toute tentative d'union, par les propos qui s'y trouvaient de soumission absolue et sans phrases. Ce discours suscita toutes sortes de susceptibilités en Angleterre.

La lettre ¹ de l'archevêque de Cantorbéry, marquée dans les papiers ci-joints, montre assez clairement l'espèce d'irritation qui fut un des résultats de ce discours. Cette irritation ne fut pas amoindrie par ce qui eut lieu bientôt après, au sujet des communications adressées par le cardinal à l'archevêque de Tolède.

Il serait, sans doute, injuste de rendre uniquement responsables des hésitations de l'archevêque de Cantorbéry les procédés du cardinal Vaughan, mais ces procédés, et la manière dont ils présentaient la question des Ordres, produisirent un effet très malheureux ; ils étaient bien faits pour amoindrir la bonne impression produite par la brochure de l'abbé Portal, les articles du *Moniteur de Rome* et des journaux français, et pour entraver d'une manière désastreuse toute tentative d'union. En effet, la réponse de l'archevêque de Cantorbéry se fit longtemps attendre. Elle reflète dans son ton l'impression causée par

¹ Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 15th October 1894, p. 137.

l'attitude du cardinal Vaughan. Heureusement, comme on peut en juger d'après les extraits des lettres adressées à Lord Halifax au sujet du discours qu'il prononça à Bristol sur l'union des Eglises, au mois de février, il est à croire que ces effets commencent déjà à s'atténuer, et que tout cœur vraiment chrétien comprend que la cause de la paix de la Chrétienté est trop grande et trop sainte pour qu'on admette qu'elle puisse être entravée par des paroles dont la portée n'est après tout que passagère. Ce qui a surtout aidé ces bonnes dispositions, et qui a produit la meilleure impression sont les sentiments qu'on a attribués sur la question des Ordres à l'abbé Duchesne. D'après certaines choses écrites dans le *Bulletin Critique* et autre part par l'abbé on a cru savoir qu'il reconnaissait la validité des Ordres conférés par l'Eglise anglicane. L'abbé Duchesne jouit d'une si grande réputation en Angleterre que les opinions qu'on lui prêtait sur cette question ont exercé une très grande influence, et ont suffi pour produire un rapprochement d'esprit qui a mis sur un tout autre terrain la question d'une conférence entre des théologiens nommés par Sa Sainteté et des ecclésiastiques anglais.

C'était dans l'espoir d'avancer encore d'un pas ce rapprochement et aussi la question de telles conférences que Lord Halifax fit à Bristol le discours dont il a été question et qu'il pria l'abbé Portal de vouloir bien remettre au cardinal Rampolla. Il crut, qu'en parlant ainsi, et en envoyant son discours à ceux des évêques anglais auxquels il était en position de s'adresser, il obtiendrait des réponses qui donneraient à Sa Sainteté les assurances que la lettre du cardinal Rampolla à l'abbé Portal devait faire produire. Il a même fait plus. Il a demandé aux archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York et à plusieurs autres membres de l'Episcopat avec qui il était en relation, quelle réponse il devait faire si on lui demandait à Rome, quelle serait l'attitude de l'Episcopat anglais en face d'une démarche du Saint Siège, ayant pour but de telles conférences au sujet de la validité des Ordres conférés par l'Eglise anglicane.

Les lettres ci-jointes, avec la seule exception de celle marquée,¹ sont les réponses qui accusent soit la réception du discours, soit la question posée par Lord Halifax sur l'accueil qu'on pouvait espérer à une proposition de conférence au sujet des Ordres. Ces lettres sont tout à fait privées et confidentielles, mais Lord Halifax croit qu'elles sont suffisantes pour mettre hors de doute

¹ The letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

qu'une demande de la part de Sa Sainteté, pour une conférence sur les Ordres, et toute autre démarche bienveillante et généreuse de la part de Rome envers l'Eglise anglicane seraient accueillies en Angleterre de la manière la plus favorable. On peut affirmer sans la moindre hésitation, que si cette question des Ordres pouvait être résolue, une des plus grandes causes d'irritation et d'éloignement qui existe à présent serait écartée, et un grand empêchement à toute tentative d'union, mis de côté. Cependant c'est une question qui ne peut être résolue qu'après une appréciation approfondie de la valeur des faits historiques et théologiques qui s'y rattachent. Même si elle était résolue de la manière la plus favorable pour l'Eglise anglicane, une telle décision n'amènerait pas nécessairement l'union, mais, sans contredit, elle serait un pas énorme dans cette direction. C'est pourquoi, s'il était permis à Lord Halifax d'adresser une prière au très Saint Père, ce qu'il demanderait serait que dans sa charité et son amour pour les âmes, Sa Sainteté voulût considérer la possibilité d'une lettre aux archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York semblable à celle dont il avait été question avec l'abbé Portal, dans laquelle il serait question entre autres choses, d'une conférence entre théologiens de toutes les opinions, nommés par Sa Sainteté, mais parmi lesquels se trouveraient l'abbé Duchesne, et ceux qui seraient désignés par les chefs de l'Eglise anglicane, pour traiter cette question des Ordres. Si en même temps, on pouvait annoncer que les ordinations de tout prêtre de l'Eglise anglicane qui se soumettrait à Rome serait dorénavant, et en attendant le résultat des conférences, faite 'sub conditione' l'effet serait énorme. Deux choses, cependant, sont absolument nécessaires pour assurer le succès de telles démarches. Une, qu'on prenne le plus grand soin pour la forme de la lettre ; l'autre, que toute communication faite aux chefs de l'Eglise anglicane soit en dehors du cardinal Vaughan et de la Hiérarchie romaine en Angleterre.

Lord Halifax ne se fait aucune illusion sur tout ce que la situation renferme de délicat et de difficile, mais ces deux points sont essentiels pour le succès de la négociation, il doit le dire, et ils ne peuvent être négligés sans la certitude de faire échouer tout espoir d'un rapprochement.

Il y aurait encore une chose sur laquelle Lord Halifax oserait attirer l'attention de Sa Sainteté. Il semble qu'il se présentera une occasion toute providentielle pour une lettre du Pape aux évêques d'Angleterre. En 1897 tous les évêques en communion avec l'archevêque de Cantorbéry doivent se réunir au palais de

Lambeth pour célébrer le treizième centenaire de l'arrivée de St. Augustin, le fondateur du Siège de Cantorbéry. On ne peut douter qu'une lettre qui ferait allusion au grand âge du Saint Père, qui parlerait de son vif désir de travailler à l'unité de la famille chrétienne, avant d'aller auprès de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, de l'importance de l'union des chrétiens pour la solution des questions sociales, et pour la défense de la foi, des nouvelles consolantes qui lui sont parvenues sur l'Eglise anglicane et qui, rappelant l'occasion qui réunira les évêques, dirait que comme St. Grégoire envoya St. Augustin pour donner une nouvelle vie aux Anglo-Saxons, lui, le Successeur de St. Grégoire, voudrait envoyer aussi un message pour tenter d'établir cette unité visible qui donnerait tout son lustre à l'Eglise de Jésus Christ, cette lettre produirait à coup sûr un très grand effet. Les raisons qui détermineraient le Saint Père à agir tout de suite et de ne pas attendre jusqu'à 1897 seraient son grand âge, le désir de voir les évêques de l'Eglise d'Angleterre se concerter et préparer d'une façon éloignée l'œuvre de l'union, et donner une preuve de bonne volonté incontestable qui pût servir de point d'appui aux bonnes volontés existant déjà dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre. Il semble à Lord Halifax que la lettre pourrait se terminer en souhaitant le renouvellement de l'esprit de Jésus Christ dans le monde, et qu'il nous soit donné de voir au moins le commencement de l'œuvre bénie de l'union.

En dernier lieu, Lord Halifax voudrait encore insister sur le fait, qui est incontestable pour tous ceux qui connaissent l'Angleterre, que l'amour propre des Anglais et leur loyal attachement aux archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York et à l'Episcopat national, ferait échouer toute démarche venant de Rome, toute communication qui ne serait pas adressée aux chefs de l'Eglise d'Angleterre.

In the beginning of Holy Week it seemed more than probable I might be obliged to leave Rome suddenly, and under this apprehension I wrote the following letter to Cardinal Rampolla to be shown, if the Cardinal saw fit, to the Pope.

Il est possible que je sois amené à quitter Rome brusquement. Un de mes parents se trouve gravement malade, et il se pourrait que je dusse aller le rejoindre.

Comme je serais désolé de m'éloigner sans avoir encore l'honneur de m'entretenir avec votre Eminence, je me résous à vous laisser par écrit les choses les plus importantes au sujet desquelles j'aurais désiré vous parler longuement.

(1) Je dois insister encore une fois sur le motif qui nous a fait choisir la question des Ordres comme point de départ. A mon avis, elle constitue l'unique terrain sur lequel les deux églises peuvent s'aborder, la seule voie par laquelle on peut amener l'Eglise d'Angleterre à reprendre avec l'Eglise de Rome les relations qu'elle doit avoir.

Cette question des Ordres est une grande cause d'irritation chez nous, on trouve en Angleterre que l'Eglise romaine a été là-dessus fort mal informée—témoin la décision du Saint Office à propos de Gordon (1704)—et par suite qu'elle a été, involontairement, sans doute, mais d'une manière certaine, complètement injuste. Certains de vos théologiens, même de ceux qui nous étaient jadis complètement hostiles, commencent, je crois, à s'en rendre compte.

Si nous, de notre côté, nous avons été injustes pour beaucoup de choses, ce dont je conviens de la manière la plus absolue, notre injustice à nous ne détruit pas la vôtre, qui s'attaque à une partie essentielle de l'Eglise anglicane, et ne m'empêche pas de vous demander une sincère reconnaissance de nos droits. C'est une simple question de justice, sur laquelle Rome devrait se prononcer, quels que fussent être les résultats d'une telle sentence. Pour moi, il me semble que plus on accorde de droits au Saint Siège, plus on est porté à lui croire le devoir de rendre justice à tout le monde.

Aux yeux de certains, une modification de la part de l'Eglise romaine produirait de mauvais résultats. Je suis entièrement convaincu du contraire. Si l'Eglise romaine reconnaissait ses torts, ce que sa supériorité même lui permet de faire facilement, elle prendrait ainsi le meilleur moyen pour nous amener à reconnaître les nôtres. Elle donnerait aussi par là une arme incomparable à tous ceux qui dans l'Eglise anglicane veulent l'union.

(2) On dit de tous cotés en Angleterre qu'il n'y a rien à espérer de Rome, et que toutes les démarches faites auprès d'elle ne peuvent aboutir qu'à un abaissement sans résultat. A moi, on m'a répété bien souvent que je me berçais de fausses espérances.

Ma venue à Rome devait, selon les mêmes personnes, être commentée de bien des façons, et amener de nouveaux malen-

tendus et de nouvelles divisions. Déjà dans la Chambre des Communes on a dit que j'étais venu à Rome chapeau bas. Ces sortes d'attaques me sont personnellement indifférentes. Ce que j'ai fait, j'ai cru devoir le faire pour le bien et non pour le succès. Mais elles sont très dangereuses, surtout en Angleterre, où la fierté nationale ne peut souffrir qu'un individu semble abaisser le peuple ou l'Eglise du pays.

Si vous pensez, Eminence, que je doive continuer à travailler encore pour l'œuvre de l'union, il ne faut pas que ces prévisions soient justifiées. Il est nécessaire que je retourne en Angleterre avec la preuve irrécusable que mon action est regardée à Rome d'un œil sympathique, et qu'elle a obtenu ici un certain succès.

Bien des esprits hésitent en ce moment ; si je réussis, ils viendront à nous ; si j'échoue, au contraire, ils se prononceront contre, et je ne pourrai plus remonter le courant qu'ils formeront.

Pour ces motifs, il me semble qu'il est absolument nécessaire que vous fassiez quelque chose à mon endroit. Vous pouvez, Eminence, m'adresser une lettre dans laquelle :

1. Vous mentionneriez les dispositions favorables du Saint Père.
2. Vous diriez que la question des Ordres sera examinée en toute justice et charité après que le Saint Siège se sera entouré des savants qui appartiennent à différents pays et aura eu recours à toutes les sources d'information.
3. Vous feriez allusion au livre que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous offrir, et à la préface de l'évêque de Salisbury.
4. Vous parleriez des conférences amicales nécessaires pour élucider les questions qui nous divisent, en particulier la question des Ordres. La gravité de la cause, et vos bontés à mon égard, sont les seules excuses que je puisse invoquer pour la liberté avec laquelle je me suis permis de vous écrire.¹

On Sunday, the 24th March, I dined with Cardinal Vaughan at the English College, where I met Cardinal Schönborn, and, I think, Dom Gasquet.

Before leaving Rome the Cardinal called upon the Abbé Portal, a personal trait on his part which it is pleasant to remember. Nor can I forget the morning the Cardinal invited us to be present at his Mass in the crypt at St. Peter's. On a previous occasion the Cardinal had also

¹ Not having occasion to leave Rome immediately, my letter received no answer, as I had further interviews with Cardinal Rampolla, whose kindness and sympathy with the object I had at heart I can never forget.

taken us all over St. Peter's himself: a better or more interesting ciccone can hardly be imagined.

I dwell the more willingly on these memories in view of the unfortunate nature of the Cardinal's action, as I must think it, in regard to other matters.

I saw Abbot Gasquet once or twice whilst I was in Rome; I think we had a long walk together one day¹ in Passion Week, and I remember then, or on some other occasion, insisting, if an equitable view were to be taken of the changes made in the Book of Common Prayer, on the necessity of allowing for admitted abuses which those changes were meant to meet, *e.g.*, the infrequency of Communion prevailing at the time and the notions then prevalent that the Sacrifice of the Mass was something more than an application and representation of the one Sacrifice on the Cross, but was a Sacrifice independent of, and in addition to it. I recollect adducing the petition of the Cornishmen on the introduction of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., that communion should be only once a year, Bishop Latimer's sermon before Convocation in Henry VIII.'s reign, and the notion that while the Sacrifice on the Cross was the expiation for original sin, the Sacrifice of the Altar was in itself an expiation for actual sin, alluded to in Article xxxi. I might have added, if I had remembered it, Bishop Gardiner's own words, when, after defining the Mass as a sacrifice ordained for two purposes, and stating that all additional notions of the Mass were abuses which might be taken away, he went on to say, 'For when men add unto the Mass an opinion of satisfaction, or of a new redemption, then do they put it to another use than it was ordained for.'²

We attended the services of Holy Week at the Gesù, where the music was sung by the students of the German College. Nothing could be more inspiring. Sir Lewis Dibdin,³ who was in Rome at the time, and of whom we saw

¹ I see Abbot Gasquet in *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 27, says it was on Wednesday, the 3rd April. He clearly, however, entirely misunderstood what I had said to him.

² So quoted from Foxe in Darwell Stone (*History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. ii. p. 150).

³ The present Dean of the Arches Court of Canterbury.

a good deal, was with us on Palm Sunday, and I think on some other days. Whether Sir Lewis has kept any bits of the boughs of olive which he received at the Altar that day at the Procession of Palms, I do not know : I believe I have got mine. Maundy Thursday, after making our Communion at the English Church, Mr. Birkbeck and I went to Mass in the Chapel of the Benedictines at Sant' Anselmo ; we were again later at the Gesù, and in the afternoon I visited various churches with the Abbé Portal. In the evening we were at St. Peter's, where Cardinal Rampolla was officiating.

On Good Friday, the 12th April, we were present at the Mass of the Presanctified at the Gesù. Afterwards we heard the Three Hours preached at San Silvestro in Capite, and in the evening we went to make our confessions at the English Church, whence I remember we came home tired out, in consequence of having had to wait in Church another three hours, owing to the great number of people all waiting for the same purpose.

On Easter Day, after making our Communion at the English Church at seven o'clock, and staying for the following Mass at eight, I took Sir Lewis Dibdin with me to the nine o'clock Mass in the Chapel of the Benedictines, after which we all went again to the Gesù at half-past ten.

The Pope granted us, including the Abbé Portal, a final private audience on the 17th April, after we had assisted at his Mass. It was impossible to be kinder or more encouraging. He took our daughter's head in his hands, as we knelt at his feet, and said, '*Mon enfant, il faut revenir me voir.*' He gave us several times over his blessing, and told us, as Cardinal Rampolla had told us the night before, to take courage, not to mind difficulties, and to persevere in our work, which would surely bring God's blessing upon us and all connected with it. After leaving the Vatican, we all went to St. Peter's to the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, and after that to pray before the Altar where St. Gregory the Great is buried. Later in the day, Lady Halifax and my daughter having left for Florence, I went to luncheon with Mgr. Kelly at the Irish College. The next

day I rejoined Lady Halifax at the Villa Palmieri,¹ the Archbishop of Canterbury arriving also the same day from Ravenna, on a visit to Lady Crawford. Writing to the Abbé Portal on the 19th, I say :—

Je ne puis vous dire comme je me suis trouvé triste en vous disant adieu. Nous avons passé de si bons jours ensemble. L'archevêque de Cantorbéry qui avait été à Ravenne est arrivé hier. Jusqu'ici je n'ai guère eu occasion de causer avec lui, mais il me semble dans d'assez bonnes dispositions—très intrigué surtout de la manière dont on le fait parler dans les journaux.

Saturday, the 20th, we went to stay with Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, seeing on Sunday various persons, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England, all as deeply interested in the cause of reunion as we were.

On Monday, the 22nd, a summary of the Pope's letter, *ad Anglos*, appeared. I called that afternoon at the Villa Palmieri to beg the Archbishop of Canterbury to be gracious about the letter, and the same evening I started for England in order to do what I could with others in the same direction.

On my arrival in England I found a letter from Mr. Lacey, to whom I had written, in which he said :—

Thank you very much for your most interesting budget which reached me yesterday morning. Immediately after reading through it, I saw in the *Globe* a brief abstract of the Holy Father's letter to the English people. But for your news I should have found this disappointing, but when one can read between the lines and take note of what is not said as well as what is said, in view of the efforts that have been made to get a different pronouncement, it becomes full of encouragement.

What a pity it is that the Pope has not addressed the Archbishops. But perhaps this was too much to hope for yet. Possibly, if his life is spared, he may in 1897. We can pray for that definitely. Why should not the Anglican bishops in 1897 address a respectful letter to the successor of St. Gregory ?

The Pope's letter was entitled 'Leo XIII. to the English people who seek the Kingdom of Christ in the unity of the Faith.' In that letter the Pope spoke of his affection and respect for the English people, of the kindly feel-

¹ Lady Crawford's villa at Florence.

ing which he had reason to believe existed in England towards himself, and how keen his wish was to further the work of reunion. He then spoke of the Mission of St. Augustine, and of the action of his predecessor, St. Gregory the Great, of the injury done to religion by the schisms of the sixteenth century, of the pleasure it had given him to hear of all the efforts made in England to solve the social questions of the day, of what was being done for the maintenance of Christian education, for the repression of intemperance, and for the maintenance of the purity of family life, for the vindication of Christian teaching from the attacks of Materialism and Rationalism and for the strict public observance of Sunday. He alluded to the great respect for the Holy Scriptures which existed in England, to the numerous charitable and religious organisations, and to the civilising influence of British rule. He then went on to speak of the duty of praying for Christian unity, and he spoke of his earnest desire to see the return of all Christian nations, now divided from him, to the religious unity of former years. In view of his great age the time could not be far distant when he should have to give an account of his stewardship to the Prince of Pastors, and how happy and blessed a thing it would be if he could bring to our Lord some fruit and realisation of all the wishes and prayers he was making for the unity of the Christian family, 'that all might be one.' 'We turn to you in England,' the Pope said, 'with all our heart, beseeching you to offer up humble and continuous prayer to God our Heavenly Father, calling upon the glorious Name and Merits of Jesus Christ, Who is the Author and Finisher of our faith, on behalf of this blessed unity.' Difficulties, the Pope said, were no reasons for refusing to labour in so holy a cause. The issues were not to be judged from a human standpoint; it was in circumstances of difficulty that the action of God's Providence shone forth with the greatest splendour. The thirteen-hundredth anniversary of St. Augustine's Mission to England was approaching: was it not the occasion, he asked, on which all reflecting minds should have in memory the faith then preached, 'Jesus

Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' The letter concluded by begging for the assistance and prayers of the Catholics in England, by invoking the intercessions of St. Gregory, St. Augustine, St. Peter and St. Paul, above all, of the Holy Mother of God, on behalf of the renewal of the glory of the ancient days. The Pope further enjoined that the prescribed prayers for unity should be recited with greater devotion, the pious practice of the Rosary was recommended for this purpose, certain indulgences were attached to a special prayer for the intercession of the Blessed Virgin which was appended to the letter; and a Plenary Indulgence was granted once a month on the usual conditions.

It will be seen that the Pope's letter was on the lines I had suggested. That it was not addressed to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York was due to Cardinal Vaughan, to whose influence it will not be perhaps rash to impute the inclusion of the concluding paragraphs, or the use that was subsequently made of them.

The Pope's letter was published on Saturday, the 20th April. On the Monday following, it was commented upon in a leading article in the *Times*. The article, after stating that the letter was one eminently worthy of a great Christian bishop, went on to say that it contained much, and implied more, which to British Protestants, with whom it identified the Anglican Church, must necessarily be repugnant. In substance the letter was an exhortation to all Christians in England, to whatever community or institution they belonged, to prayer. The letter, however, did not seem a hopeful means of bringing about the object aimed at. From whatever standpoint it was approached, the hope (of reunion) underlying the Pope's letter was idle and vain, and coming as the letter did from so sagacious a diplomatist as Leo XIII., the letter itself seemed to recognise this, by giving no hint of any intention to make any concession or enter into any negotiation,¹ so that it was puzzling to understand why the letter had

¹ Evidently in reference to conferences on disputed points, including that of the validity of English Orders.

been written at all : but the probable explanation was that the Pope had been approached by the extreme members of the sacerdotal party in England as to the possibility of corporate reunion, a matter which they were known to have much at heart, who had represented to him that many members of the Anglican Church shared their views, that in consequence the Pope had promised to address the English people, and that by ' what looked like an error on the part of so expert a diplomatist ' he had allowed his purpose to be known. It had, therefore, ' to be carried out,' but before doing so, he had had recourse to his regular advisers. Cardinal Vaughan paid a long visit to Rome, and doubtless other Roman Catholic bishops and dignitaries in England were consulted. It was not to be imagined that cool men of the world, intimately acquainted with the true feelings of the English nation towards Rome and Roman doctrine, could confirm the roseate prospect of reconciliation painted by the irresponsible enthusiasts of the English Church Union. Doubtless they told the Pope the truth as it was their duty to do : doubtless, too, the Pope came to see that their reports, however disappointing they might prove to be, did contain an accurate representation of the facts. The letter, therefore, was issued, but it was ' marked by two significant features ' : it did not contain a single word as to the possibility of any change of discipline, and in the part addressed to Catholics it insisted ' in the strongest way and in the plainest words ' on teaching and practices about which the greatest difficulty would be felt in England. ' Such words,' the article continued, must have been used with a ' definite and specific purpose.' ' Reunion with Rome,' the article concluded, ' is at present a mere dream, and Leo XIII. has done his best to make this perfectly plain.'

A comparison of the article in the *Times* with the utterances of the Cardinal could leave little doubt as to the source of its inspiration. The hands might be the hands of Esau, but the voice was the voice of Jacob. Writing to the Abbé Portal I say :—

C'est un catholique et non pas un anglican ou un protestant

qui a écrit l'article dans le *Times*. J'ai vu le cardinal, et il n'a pas nié le fait. Mgr. Merry del Val est tout à fait dans la confiance du cardinal Vaughan, qui lui envoie pour le Pape tous les journaux anglais.

Despite the end of the letter, emphasized as that end was by the *Times*, the Pope's letter was well received.

To Mr. Ward I wrote :—

The Pope's letter is really doing wonders. It pleases the Low Church people very much. I was with Mr. Webb Peploe yesterday : you know who and what he is, my accuser to the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ He said the letter was most touching, that it went to the heart—only, there was the end, *i.e.*, the paragraph about the Rosary, etc. You see my estimation of the situation was perfectly accurate. And then, that the effect of the letter should be damaged by the end ! I am sure you would be pleased if you saw, when I have explained the situation, how much all hearts are drawn to Leo XIII., and what a deep-seated wish for union there really is.

In reference to the concluding paragraphs of the Pope's letter, the Cardinal in a letter to Mr. Ward, dated the 3rd May, says :—

Halifax told me of his regret, and I replied that had there been no distinctive note, as that sounded in the address to Catholics, the Holy Father would have laid himself open to imputations of a certain want of openness and to dishonesty, or at least to the accusation of an astute diplomatic trick. It might have taken in and conciliated some by so much *suppressio veri* for a time.

Affectionate messages to Lord Halifax, whom I like extremely, though he seems somehow hopelessly impossible to convince and bring over.

As if there was any 'diplomatic trick' in omitting a

¹ The Rev. Hammer William Webb Peploe, Vicar of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. He had commented severely on my visit to Rome in a published letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury but now asked me to address his people on the subject : an invitation which I gladly accepted, but which fell through owing to fears of some of the ladies of the congregation as to the consequences of such an intrusion.

reference to special devotions which had no necessary connection with the contents of the letter, and which were calculated to impede the object with which that letter had been written !

It will be convenient here, in order to give a connected narrative of events, to include a summary of the Memorandum I circulated privately on my return to England, detailing what had occurred, together with extracts from a few of the letters I received bearing further witness to the genuine and real desire for reunion which existed.

In that Memorandum, after mentioning the circumstances which had led to my acquaintance with the Abbé Portal, and our reasons for taking up the question of English Orders in the interests of reunion, I spoke of the Abbé's action in France, of his visit to England, his subsequent interview with Cardinal Rampolla, and his audience with the Pope, of the suggestion that some communication should be made from Rome to the English Archbishops, and of the possibility of friendly conferences in which the question of Orders and other matters might be discussed. I then alluded to the attitude of Cardinal Vaughan and the irritation of many of the English Roman Catholics, showing that far from wishing to make the best of the Church of England, they desired to emphasize every possible reason which could be alleged against the more favourable view of the position and claims of the English Communion put forward by the Abbé Portal. I spoke of the representations made to the Pope,—how intolerable it was that foreigners should interfere in matters about which they had been completely misinformed, declaring that any hesitation as to the invalidity of English Orders would have the effect of stopping individual conversions. I mentioned my own visit to Rome, my audience with the Pope, the fact that the Abbé Duchesne had been asked by the Pope to draw up a memorandum for his information on the subject of English Orders, in which the Abbé had pronounced in their favour on historical grounds, an opinion which had been further confirmed by Mgr. Gasparri, the Professor of Canon Law at the Institute of Paris, and the author of works of a very high reputation, who, upon

theological and other grounds had come almost to the same conclusion as the Abbé Duchesne. I also referred to a careful memorandum sent to Cardinal Rampolla by Baron von Hügel,¹ who had been spending the winter at Rome, in which a more favourable view of the validity of the English Orders had been taken. I said that so far as I could learn, every one who had studied the *De Hierarchia* by Mr. Lacey and Mr. Denny admitted how strong the case was for their validity, and that if nothing was done to divert the present current of feeling, it was impossible to say what great consequences might result in the future from what was now being attempted. To secure, however, all that might reasonably be hoped for, the Pope and the Roman authorities must be convinced that the members of the English Church in putting forward the question of the validity of English Orders were actuated by an honest and sincere desire to remove an impediment out of the way of future union, and were not merely desirous of strengthening their own position. If the Roman authorities were convinced that the English Church really desired peace and union on the basis of the faith of the undivided Church, that its theologians, without distinction of party, were prepared to consider favourably any explanations which might be offered, with a view to reunion on that basis, I believed that with a real knowledge of all the facts of the case, together with a desire to make the best instead of the worst of the English Church the question of the validity of English Orders would present comparatively little difficulty. The obstacles in the way of all attempts in the direction of union would be enormously lessened if both sides could be convinced, first, of each other's sincerity in wishing to arrive at an agreement, and in the next place that the agreement contemplated was not a mere alliance, or a federation of independent churches professing divergent creeds, but a union founded upon the profession of the

¹ Baron Frederick von Hügel. See Abbot Gasquet's *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 64, where it is stated, 'Cardinal Ledochowski . . . told us that a Catholic layman had written a memorandum on the business, and had sent it to him. He considered it as *un'impertinenza* for a layman to try and dictate the course of events on such a matter.'

one Faith, with only such differences in regard to matters of discipline and practice as might rightly be acquiesced in. It was the feeling on the part of Rome that English Churchmen were quite content with their isolation, were indifferent to unity, and much more concerned about strengthening their own position as against herself than in striving after that visible union which was the subject of our Lord's last prayer before His Passion, that rendered even friendly Roman Catholics so indifferent to what seemed to us our undeniable rights. On the other hand, it was the conviction that no explanations were possible, and that Rome would consider nothing but absolute submission to the most exaggerated statement of her claims, which made English Churchmen so slow to express the hope, which nevertheless they entertained, that it might please God in His own good time and in His own good way to heal the schisms which now divided Christendom.

Englishmen, as I had insisted throughout at Rome, were much too deeply attached to the National Episcopate, too proud of the Church of England, too convinced of the truth and integrity of its claims, to forgive any one who should seem to ignore its rights and to be indifferent to its honour. But they were not ungenerous, and though they believed that Rome had been unjust to them in the past, they were also conscious how much fault there had been on their side, how far the practice of the Church of England had fallen short of its profession, and they would be the first to welcome any genuine attempt on the part of the Roman Church to understand their position, in the hope that, with God's blessing, such an attempt might be the first step towards that reunion of Christendom which they knew Leo XIII. so ardently desired, and for which all who had the cause of Christianity at heart must so earnestly pray. It was for these and other reasons that all language likely to mislead and to irritate should be avoided in England—the mischief such language might produce at the present moment could hardly be exaggerated. Why insist that reunion is impossible? Nothing is impossible with God, nor do those who really

desire to find and to follow a path which may lead to peace begin by insisting on all the difficulties which beset the way. On the other hand, a generous appreciation of the real desire for reunion that had inspired the Pope's letter, some action on the part of the English Episcopate witnessing to the wish of the English Church to do all in its power to heal the divisions of the sixteenth century, and a general response to the Pope's invitation that all should unite in prayer, in order to obtain from God the restoration of the unity of Christendom, would produce results the consequences of which in the direction of peace and union it was impossible to exaggerate. For the realisation of such hopes, however, two things were necessary: there must be patience on both sides, a willingness to overlook unfortunate utterances, to minimise instead of exaggerating differences, and among ourselves a wider perception than at present existed how far our prevailing sentiment and attitude, not only towards the Holy See but in regard to much else affecting the practice of Catholics abroad, differed from what had obtained in any other age of the Church.

In the meantime, those who were well acquainted with the state of affairs at Rome did not hesitate to declare that the results already obtained towards securing a better understanding of our position were very great, and that with prudence and discretion in England important consequences might be expected from them.

I added, as it had been remarked to me more than once, both abroad and in England, that time was required to familiarise people with ideas which at first sight appeared to them startling, and to which they had been in no way accustomed.

From among the letters I received in reply to the Memorandum, I may quote the following extracts.

The Rev. Charles Gore (present Bishop of Oxford, then Canon of Westminster) wrote:—

As to the question of the Pope's letter, my desire is that we should earnestly and thankfully recognise the most Christian

appeal the Pope has made ; and I heartily wish the Archbishop would have done so officially. I think that the 'nation' would welcome (so far as it is Christian) a clear lead in a liberal Catholic sense.

I am much obliged, the Bishop of Llandaff said, for the deeply interesting and important Memorandum which I have just had the pleasure of perusing. I think all who desire, as who does not, the reunion of Christendom, owe you a deep debt of gratitude for the great efforts you are putting forth to attain such a consummation. I sincerely hope that at the next Lambeth Conference, when the bishops of the whole Anglican communion will meet, this all-important subject may have serious consideration.

'Conferences of theologians' the Bishop of Dover thought were necessary, 'before we can make much of real progress towards reunion.'

Lady Gwendolen Cecil, writing from Hatfield, said :—

I have been hindered by one thing or another the last day or two, or would have written before to tell you how much interested my father¹ was with the Memorandum and the two accompanying private letters which I showed him last Friday. They reveal a far more advanced and encouraging condition of the question than one had received any definite idea of from what has been published. It is impossible, I suppose, to speculate to any advantage as to what would be the ultimate result of the recognition of our Orders, but it seems certain that it would remove one of the most dangerous impediments to personal charitable feeling on the part of our clergy particularly, to the Roman Church. And to 'follow charity' seems the only definite course open to us just now.

I must thank you very much from my father, as well as on my own account, and on my mother's, for having let us see these papers.

The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles wrote that the contents of the Memorandum were a revelation to him, and showed how much ground there was for hope.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol emphasizing what

¹ Robert Arthur Talbot, third Marquis of Salisbury.

I had endeavoured to impress on the authorities at Rome said :—

The Church of England is a great and inclusive body, but still cannot consider itself formally addressed in a document to the English people, which by its tenor, is addressed to non-Roman Catholics (of all shades) and to Roman Catholics also. Under such complicated circumstances, we must, as it seems to me, wait in silence for something more directly addressing itself to, or affecting, the great Church to which we belong. Then, authority might speak.'

The Bishop of Colchester told me he had 'long yearned and prayed, and urged others to pray, for reunion,' and it seemed to him that some of the great difficulties in the way were being overcome. He trusted the day would come when 'the part your Lordship has so courageously and wisely taken in this matter may be appreciated at its right value by a far larger number of Anglican Churchmen.'

The Bishop of Cairo, Illinois, United States of America, wished me to know that on Whitsunday he had preached in his Church on Church Unity, and spoken 'of the letter of Leo XIII. as one of the most encouraging signs of the times.' 'What a blessed thing,' he added, 'it is to labour for peace.'

A letter from the Abbé Duchesne of the 8th of June 1895 may also here be given:—

Je vous remercie vivement de votre memorandum et de la lettre du P. Puller. Son livre ¹ m'avait été envoyé par M. Portal. Ce que j'en ai lu m'a donné l'impression d'une érudition sérieuse, mais un peu courte de vue. Je souhaite avoir le temps de traiter ce sujet, en dehors, bien entendu, de toute polémique et d'une façon plus objective.

C'est aujourd'hui seulement que j'ai été reçu par le Saint Père. Il m'a tout d'abord parlé des ordinations anglicanes. Ses dispositions n'ont pas varié. Il sait ce qu'il a fait, ce qu'il peut attendre pour le présent et espérer pour l'avenir, en tenant compte des effets de la prière des chrétiens et de la bonté de Dieu. Je n'ai pas omis de lui parler des membres du haut clergé anglican dont j'ai eu l'honneur de faire la connaissance,

¹ *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.*

notamment de Lightfoot,¹ et de l'évêque actuel de Salisbury. Je crois que le Saint Père ne s'en tiendra pas à sa lettre et qu'il précisera son action. Dieu veuille que ses futures tentatives rencontrent des cœurs bien disposés. L'accueil fait à sa lettre donne lieu de l'espérer. Il faut ici faire prévaloir le sentiment de la charité ecclésiastique sur l'appréciation des difficultés, historiques ou autres, qui pourraient le contrarier.

I print here a letter from Constantine Pobiédonostzeff (Chief Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod), to Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, on account of the interest attaching to the position and the person of the writer, and for the sake of its bearing on a letter from the Bishop of Peterborough (p. 367). The speech in question had reference to the religious matters in Poland, and was made, I believe, before the Council of the Empire.

I heartily thank you for your most interesting letter from Rome and about Rome. I am very glad that you were pleased with my speech of 6th April about the late Emperor, and I certainly have no objection to your communicating it to any one you wish, more particularly to Cardinal Rampolla, to whom you have already given so much information about Russia which was new to him. This ignorance of the Latins about the Russian Church and people is astonishing. It, of course, comes from their contemptuous attitude towards the East in general, and from the pride of their own culture. They are so entirely convinced that they have the light, and that we are in darkness. Moreover, they have not the slightest power of perception of national particularities, or of the psychological peculiarities of each race of people, which, without doubt, are reflected on its ecclesiastical consciousness, and on the requirements of the spirit in teaching and divine service. Rome is blinded by its age-long habit of dominating, which has nurtured in her a consciousness of a right to rule, and causes her to regard that right as an article of faith. In the present Pope [Leo XIII.] that consciousness is very strong, while his piety and kind-heartedness rouse him to invite all to come under his rule, and to nourish a strong hope that they will answer to the call. But you know Russia and our people well enough, and of course understand that it is a voice crying in the wilderness. We cannot *believe*

¹ Rt. Rev. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham.

in the Pope (dogmatically) as he wishes us to do, for no sort of living Vicar of Christ can we acknowledge ; and while we may believe in the sincerity of the present Pope, we can put no sort of trust in the craftiness of his generals and of the officers of his army.

The reunion of the Churches in the present condition of [men's] minds—if it is not an accommodation by bargain, a transaction—is nothing more than a reverie or divination concerning the future. One ought to remember Romans xi. 32 *et seq.*, and also to remember that with God a day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years like one day.

May 8 (20), 1895.

CHAPTER IX

CORRESPONDENCE ARISING OUT OF THE LETTER *Ad Anglos*—LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, PUBLISHED IN THE *Times*, 30TH AUGUST 1895—CARDINAL VAUGHAN'S SPEECH AT BRISTOL, 9TH SEPTEMBER—NORWICH CHURCH CONGRESS AND SERMON OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK—LETTERS FROM MR. BIRKBECK AS TO REUNION WITH THE RUSSIAN CHURCH—LETTER FROM THE PRINCE OF WALES (KING EDWARD VII.) AS TO THE VISIT OF THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH TO RUSSIA—CORONATION OF THE CZAR, 1896

IN the course of the summer I had the opportunity of speaking at various meetings, and to different bodies of clergy, on the subject of reunion, and thus to make more widely known the events detailed in the Memorandum. The account I was able to give was everywhere received with the greatest sympathy and interest. Shortly before the annual meeting of the English Church Union I received the following letter from the Rev. E. G. Wood, Vicar of St. Clement's, Cambridge. I give it as an illustration of feelings very generally entertained :—

Would you like me to speak upon reunion at the English Church Union afternoon meeting ? It may be that after the selected speakers have spoken some members may get up and say things in a somewhat Protestant sense concerning the Holy See that neither you nor I would like, and therefore, something on the other side might be well said.

My line would be practically that of Bossuet. One must distinguish between the Papacy as an institution, a fact now, after so many centuries (whatever may be said about its origin), an historical fact, and the Papacy as a theological proposition. That is to say, it may well be an institution in Christendom that has grown up in the order of Divine Providence, though upon it,

considered as a Providential product, there may have become engrafted many things as a consequence of human action and thought—things which, for want of a better word, we might roughly and generically call Ultramontaniam—all of which might even be not only præter-providential, but even anti-providential. And yet still there would remain the providential fact or product, the Papacy. As such it must have had a Divine purpose to fulfil in the past. That it did fulfil such a purpose, at any rate to a very large extent, I, for one, cannot doubt. Not only did it do so as regards Western civilisation and order, but also as regards the Western Church it was the champion of the rights of the Church against Erastianism, which began under Constantine and, but for the Papacy, would (humanly speaking) have overwhelmed the Church under the kingdoms which arose out of the break-up of the Roman Empire, and under the later Empire. Has the Providential Papacy still a work to do? I believe it has. One great danger that seems to be looming in the future—we see it already in operation in the Colonial Churches and in Scotland—is that the laity may claim the right to govern the Church on an equality with the Hierarchy. The Papacy seems to me to have a great future before it in holding the balance, and exhibiting and maintaining the traditions of the Church. Explanations, to take Dr. Pusey's line, might well be offered, which might make the acceptance of the Papacy not only possible, but welcome, to those who do not believe in a supremacy *de jure divino*, but in a Primacy founded on an ecclesiastical title, and in a great position in the order of Divine Providence.

What I mean by the Papacy as a theological proposition is perhaps best expressed by the formula: 'All spiritual jurisdiction flows out of the Chair of Peter,' so that no Sacrament can be licitly, and some, not validly, administered, save by one who receives his jurisdiction from the Pope. This is practically expressed by the quinquennial faculties. It does, logically, reduce every bishop and priest to the position of a delegate of the Pope. This is, however, a position which, though the position taken up by most champions of the Holy See at the present time, does not necessarily follow from authoritative formal decisions or definitions. It does not follow from the Tridentine Creed. It was not the Gallican position. It is not even involved in the claim to the appellate jurisdiction. Such an appellate jurisdiction, if claimed on ecclesiastical grounds,

may well be, I believe it would be, in the greatest causes of the *de bene esse* of the Church. Then Rome as the home of Catholic traditions, their treasury, and on the other hand the school of interpretation of such customs and traditions, and the adapter of them to changing needs, may be, and ought to be, looked to for guidance at any rate by all we mean by Western Christendom, *i.e.*, the greater part now of the *orbis terrarum*. We want to teach people to give to Rome the honour and the precedence which is her due, and to show that the doing so is perfectly consistent with loyalty to the pastors, the bishops, under whom God has placed us. The notion that Rome has to climb down and be no more than the chief see of Italy is perfectly preposterous. We ought not to want to diminish her honour or to dim her glory; but we may dutifully ask for, hope for, and pray for explanations.

On the 9th of September, Cardinal Vaughan made a speech at Bristol, in which he defined the kernel of the question of reunion to be the authority of the Pope by divine right to teach and govern the whole Church without any explanation or discussion as to the nature of or limit to that authority, both of which were essential if misunderstanding was to be avoided. In the same speech he asserted that the English Ordinal was compiled with the object of excluding the sacrificial power of the priesthood. He also said that the suggestion of corporate reunion savoured wholly of flesh and blood, and that there was no hope for reunion except by individual submission to the See of Peter, and the obstacle to this submission was pride.

A few days earlier the Archbishop of Canterbury had published a Pastoral Letter¹ in which he spoke of the 'friendly advance made from a foreign Church to the people in England without any reference or regard to the Church of England.' 'We cannot fail,' the Archbishop said, 'to find in it a call to renewed faith in the mission of the Church,' and he 'commended this call to the thought and prayers of all who loved our Lord.' 'Our divisions are the chief obstacle

¹ *Times*, 30th August 1895.

in the progress of His Gospel,' and 'we accept the many expressions of anxiety to be delivered from them as a sign among us of God's purpose at the present time.' The Archbishop recalled the fact that the Lambeth Conferences of 1878 and 1888 had commended the matter of reunion to the special prayers of all people 'in preparation of opportunities for further action.' The aspiration after reunion, the Archbishop said, 'is a vast one: it must take account of the East and non-Episcopal bodies at home and abroad; it must also consider the Christianising of Asia and Africa under the most extremely varying circumstances.' 'The Roman Church had not always proved capable of retaining its hold on nations once its own.' It had 'invited the English people into reunion with itself in apparent unconsciousness of the position of the English Church,' and in that 'invitation it had paraded methods of worship and rewards of worship repugnant to Teutonic Christianity. For the unquestioned kindness of the invitation which invited our common prayers, the Archbishop said: 'we must all be thankful.' . . . 'we must rejoice in the manifestation of such a spirit of love,' 'but the appeal made was inadequate, recognition [of the English Church] might have lent a meaning to the mention of reunion.' History showed what 'great duties in view of reunion were being forced upon the Church of England.' 'Thinkers not belonging to the fold of the Church of England' had spoken of the providential position occupied by the Church of England in regard to the work of reunion.¹ The Church of England had to be mindful of the obligations which lay upon her in regard to reunion, both in regard to East and West, and to be careful to forfeit no advantage 'which might assist her in bringing the parted Churches of Christ into better understanding and fellowship.'

¹ 'Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre. L'Eglise Anglicane, qui nous touche d'une main, touche de l'autre ceux que nous ne pouvons toucher; et quoique, sous un certain point de vue, elle soit en butte aux coups des deux partis, et qu'elle présente le spectacle un peu ridicule d'un révolté qui prêche l'obéissance, cependant elle est très précieuse sous d'autres aspects, et peut être considérée comme une de ces intermédiaires chimiques, capable d'approcher des élémens inassociables de leur nature.'—Comte de Maistre, *Considérations sur la France*, c. ii.

Writing to the Abbé Portal, I said :—

La lettre de l'archevêque de Canterbury et le discours du cardinal Vaughan à Bristol laissent beaucoup à désirer des deux côtés. Il me semble qu'au fond, passant en revue toute la situation et en faisant attention à ce que l'archevêque implique, et à ce qu'il ne dit pas, et en se souvenant aussi de ce que disait le cardinal Vaughan l'année passée, (rappelez-vous son discours à Preston et sa lettre à l'archevêque de Tolède), il est permis de croire que nous avons beaucoup gagné depuis septembre 1894. La question de la réunion occupe tous les esprits. Et comme l'indifférence est ce que nous avons le plus à redouter, c'est beaucoup.

Je ne veux pas dire que la lettre de l'archevêque m'a plu, mais je crois qu'elle n'a pas fait de mal ici, et qu'on peut facilement se méprendre sur sa portée. Les journaux protestants ne l'approuvent pas beaucoup, ce qui est toujours bon signe. Mais je vais traiter tout cela longuement à Norwich le mois prochain, et j'espère pouvoir en tirer bon parti.

Le droit divin du Saint Père comme successeur de St. Pierre, et centre de l'Eglise d'un côté, les droits Apostoliques de l'Episcopat qu'ils tiennent directement de Notre Seigneur, de l'autre, voilà les deux vérités qu'il faut reconnaître. Ces deux vérités réunies sont, j'en suis persuadé, le point où on trouvera la paix.

La paix, Dieu la veut. Il ne faut pas se décourager. Rome ne fut pas construite en un jour, et quand on songe à la patience de Dieu à l'égard de la méchanceté des hommes, et surtout à l'égard de leurs sottises, on peut bien prendre patience. Si vous avez l'occasion, dites au cardinal Rampolla qu'au fond tout marche pour le mieux, et qu'il peut être certain que le Saint Père et lui ont commencé une œuvre qui servira grandement à l'honneur de Dieu et au bien de Son Eglise.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, 9 octobre 1895.

Le cardinal Bourret est chez nous ; il s'intéresse beaucoup à nos affaires. Il m'a beaucoup encouragé au sujet de notre œuvre. Quand je lui ai dit que nous nous proposons de publier une *Revue* pour agir sur le milieu intellectuel, il m'a dit : ' Oh, oui, c'est là qu'il faut frapper.' Il m'a paru très content de tout ce que nous faisons, d'ailleurs il me l'a dit, et il n'est pas homme

à dire le contraire de ce qu'il pense, même par politesse. Notre second numéro du bulletin¹ portera une lettre de lui, comme encouragement.

Je reçois au sujet de notre association les meilleurs encouragements, les adhésions arrivent tous les jours. Pour notre *Revue*, j'aurai un article de l'abbé Boudinhon sur le livre du chanoine Everest, à propos du pouvoir des Clefs. L'abbé établira que la juridiction des évêques ne vient pas du Pape directement, mais qu'elle découle de la communion. Je crois vous avoir indiqué cette thèse comme probable au Mont-Dore. Il est évident qu'on ne peut avoir juridiction sur les âmes, si on n'est pas en communion avec l'Eglise de Jésus Christ. J'ai vu le Baron von Hügel qui m'a donné des détails fort intéressants. Il s'intéresse lui-même de tout cœur à nos affaires. Chez lui, j'ai rencontré M. Gore.² A tous deux j'ai répété un propos du Cardinal Bourret, au sujet de Duchesne. 'On parle de lui pour en faire un Cardinal.' Vous voyez que nous marchons.

Nous allons tout à fait nous organiser, de suite après la retraite, et je crois pouvoir vous répondre d'un grand bien.

Preaching in the cathedral at Norwich on the 8th October 1895, at the opening of the Church Congress, the Archbishop of York, speaking of reunion, had made use of such expressions as the following :—

Reunion is in the air . . . a voice from Rome has spoken to us, moved by the same desire . . . it breathes from first to last a spirit of fatherly love . . . the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as understood by St. Gregory in the sixth century, or by St. Bernard in the twelfth, was widely different from the idea which is now pressed upon us (by Cardinal Vaughan) . . . a return to the earlier conception is not beyond the bounds of hope . . . there are deepening evidences of the longing for the reunion of the separated members of Christendom . . . the Pope's letter will not be fruitless . . . it has quickened us all in our earnest endeavours after the object in view . . . a Pope of the seventeenth century declared his predecessors were

¹ Bulletin de l'association catholique pour la Réunion de l'Eglise anglicane. This Association had been established at the Mother House of the Lazarist Fathers. The Cardinal's letter was published with his authorisation, on the first page of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, November 1895.

² The Rev. Charles Gore, afterwards Bishop of Birmingham, and now Bishop of Oxford.

responsible for the loss of England, we may well hope that the day will come when another Pope may be the instrument of reconciliation.

In my own address delivered at the Church Congress, I begged those to whom I was speaking to remember that :

A work which aims at nothing less than the removal of barriers which have suspended for eight centuries the intercommunion of East and West, and have severed from the Roman Communion almost the whole Teutonic element of Christendom, is certain to meet with hindrances. Do you suppose that the great enemy of souls will not do his best to prevent the armies of God from uniting to pull down his strongholds? We have no reason, therefore, to be discouraged by misconceptions and prejudices, but we have every reason to try and remove them. For example, it has recently been said that we look for the reunion of Christendom on the basis of a compromise of doctrine ; but who amongst us has ever contemplated reunion on such a basis ? We repudiate as earnestly as Cardinal Vaughan himself the possibility of any such compromise, but we do believe, as apparently the Cardinal does himself (if I may judge from another passage in his recent address), that some of the doctrinal differences which separate us from one another are more apparent than real, and others are the result of misunderstandings, which fuller explanations might remove. As Dr. Pusey, writing in 1867, said, ‘ Much of the difficulty in the way of reunion arises from prejudice. English people believe things to be matters of faith in the Roman Church which in some cases are no matters of faith, in others are not what they believe them to be. Much might be done to remove such difficulties by accurate statements, how much is *de fide*, how much only proximate to faith, how much opinions only ? ’

It is not compromise that is wanted, but explanations on both sides. Let me attempt an example, and that with reference to the point which the Cardinal tells us is the ‘ crucial one—the very kernel—in regard to the whole question of reunion.’ ‘ What,’ the Cardinal asks, ‘ is the meaning of the reunion of Christendom ? ’ And he replies, ‘ It means a return to the constitutional corporate union of the head and the members of the Church which existed before the break-up of Christendom in the sixteenth century. Until then all the nations of Western Christendom were united to the Apostolic See of Rome. It was a con-

stitutional corporate union of the head and members.' Reunion, then, must mean a return to the visible union which formerly existed, and the kernel of the question is the admission of the claim that the Pope is head of the visible Church by a distinct act of our Lord Jesus Christ. But to believe, as has recently been well said by Canon Everest in his admirable essay on *The Gift of the Keys*, that our Lord did provide a visible head for His Church, and that this headship was to be the prerogative of St. Peter's successor; or, with Dr. Döllinger, that a care for the weal of the Church and the duty of watching over the observance of the canons was involved in the gift of the keys to St. Peter, is one thing; to found upon this prerogative a claim for the successive occupants of St. Peter's chair to be the sole fountain of the Episcopate itself, so that every bishop derives his commission and jurisdiction from them, is another. Or, to put it more concisely, as Mr. Gore states it in his *Roman Claims*, for the successors of St. Peter to be something which other bishops are not, is surely a very different thing from the successors of St. Peter being to other bishops the source of what they are. In regard to the first, Archbishop Bramhall says: 'Concerning order or interior jurisdiction, I know of no controversy between the Church of Rome and us but one—whether the Bishop of Rome alone does derive his jurisdiction *immediately* from Christ, and all other bishops do derive theirs immediately from him.' And so Thorndike. 'I admit,' he says, 'a regular pre-eminence for him (the Pope) above all other bishops (which is seen in the recourse had to him before others in matters concerning the whole Church), but deny that infinite power which nothing can be alleged to prove.' But, indeed, when the Cardinal talks of the constitutional power of the Pope, what difference which might not be susceptible of explanation remains? It is not the constitutional claims of the Pope, as possessing a primacy by our Lord's own appointment, which the English Church rejects, but the apparent stretching of this power so as to absorb the independent rights of the Episcopate, and reduce them to mere representatives of the Pope. Assure us that this is not the case, and that in the domain of doctrine the separation which some have thought was asserted by the Vatican Council to exist between the Pope and the rest of the Episcopate, so that the former could act without the latter, is no part of the teaching of the Roman Church, and you have gone a long way towards laying the foundation which Cardinal Vaughan has told us is necessary for reunion.

Surely it is in this spirit of explanation that we ought to approach our differences. To try to make the best of an opponent's position (if opponents we must be called), to put the most favourable construction on facts that require explanation, is the surest way of winning hearts and arriving at the truth. We have much to gain from Rome, but Rome has also much to gain from us. Is it no loss to the Roman Church to have retained within her communion nothing but the Latin races in Europe? Would not the restoration of the Teutonic element, and the vigour and independence of the Anglo-Saxon, to her fold be a gain, the importance of which, in the interests of Christianity at large, it is hardly possible to measure. To me it seems that we are in some sort at the branching of two ways. A great opportunity of promoting reunion has been opened out to us; are we going to avail ourselves of it? Despite all that has been accomplished, the Oxford Movement and the great Church revival which it initiated will have failed if we do not keep steadily before our eyes the miseries of a divided Christendom, and the duty of doing all in our power to heal the schism of the sixteenth century. Both the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Vaughan discern in the present time signs that something is preparing for England in the secret of Divine Providence. What is opening out before us is the opportunity of preparing the way for the reunion of Christendom. Let it be ours to leave no efforts untried to further God's gracious purpose, and to hasten the day when we may be enabled in one vast and united army to fight against all the sin and evil of the world, and to spread the light of the glorious Gospel of God our Saviour to the ends of the earth.

H. E. Cardinal Vaughan to Lord Halifax

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., *October 14, 1895.*

Your very remarkable speech, delivered with a courage worthy of martyrdom! I have read with much interest. You seem to accept for yourself, and to say that the Anglican Church does not deny a Primacy established by Christ Himself for the Church, and that this was a constitutional act. What I am anxious to understand is this: Do you mean a Primacy of honour only, or a Primacy of jurisdiction? If it be a Primacy of jurisdiction, that is what we mean by the term Papal Supremacy.

I quite understand the point which you added, viz., that the

Papacy has unduly encroached on Episcopal rights—without, of course, agreeing to it.

But, if you can assure me on the first point, I shall feel that I understand your real meaning better than I do now.

The Rev. T. A. Lacey to Lord Halifax

MADINGLEY, October 1895.

I had no intention of keeping you so long waiting for my note on the Cardinal's question, but when I came to look into it, I found it no easy matter to draw one. As was the case with a letter of his which you sent me last spring, the looseness of the Cardinal's expressions makes it difficult to answer him without either spreading into a regular thesis, or, on the other hand, evading his real point. The equivocal term *primacy* is the difficulty. As used in the terminology of Ecclesiastical organisation, this refers only to a grade of honour. The Archbishops of Arles, Toledo and Armagh as *primates* of Gaul, Spain and Ireland, respectively, have only a sort of precedence over the other metropolitans of those countries. But the word thus established has been taken as a convenient term to express the Papal prerogatives, which are of another kind, and the equivocation thus produced has not been without result.

A primacy of the Holy See in the whole world of the *same sort* as that which Toledo has in Spain hardly any one would deny, but the term is made to cover a great deal more, and by its very indeterminateness lends itself to encroachment.

In the brief answer to the question which I have at last managed to work out by a rigorous process of excision, I dwell upon the useful distinction between *auctoritas* and *potestas*. The former associates well with *primacy* as properly used, the latter with jurisdiction. Indeed, jurisdiction is essentially the *use of potestas*. I think *auctoritas* is clearly implied in the charge of St. Peter, 'Strengthen thy brethren,' and *pace* Canon Everest, I think that charge is as clearly distinguishable from the grant of the keys, which is the grant of *jurisdiction* or *potestas*.

I believe it can be clearly made out that the plenitude of *potestas* belongs to all bishops, *collectively and severally*, which is the meaning of St. Cyprian's famous phrase '*episcopatus unus cuius in solidum pars ab omnibus tenetur*,' and that the only *potestas* superior to that of a single bishop is that of the bishops collectively in whole or in part.

But as the bishops of a province collectively have certainly committed a portion of their collective *potestas* to the metropolitan, and this commission is confirmed by ecclesiastical law, so that the metropolitan himself exercises a limited jurisdiction over his several suffragans, so it is obvious that the whole Catholic Episcopate might commit to the Pope a similar jurisdiction over the several bishops. Such jurisdiction, however, would be *ex jure ecclesiastico*.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the several bishops differ widely in *auctoritas*, both according to their individual learning and sanctity, and also according to the dignity of their sees, and I see no difficulty in according to the Pope a *primacy of authority* which should be *ex jure divino*. But it is extremely hard to prove.

To sum up: the word primacy does not properly connote *jurisdiction*, but *honour*. We do not, however, mean that the occupant of the Holy See has no more than a primacy of honour. His primacy implies an authority (*auctoritas* as distinguished from *potestas*) greater than that of any other bishop, which we find manifested in the issue of *directive* letters to bishops in various parts of the Church. Should any one call this a *Primacy of Jurisdiction*, we might perhaps demur to the strict accuracy of the phrase, but I think we should make no further objection.

The author¹ of the book you sent me has a firm grip of the meaning of the Sacrifice under *one* aspect, and that an aspect which is certainly neglected, though not ignored, in the Roman schools. But he can see nothing else, and he is possessed of that execrable Anglican (and Eastern) spirit which is determined to differ from Rome. The result is that even when the Roman authorities and the Council of Trent are entirely at one with him he perversely interprets them in a contrary sense. He tries to foist upon the Church the most questionable speculations of Franzelin, who was a risky, though a great, theologian. Then he lumps together, in a note, as belonging to the same 'Jesuit School' Bellarmine, Suarez, Lessius, Cienfuegos, and Franzelin, though Lessius and Cienfuegos are absolutely at one with his thesis—so far as it is positive—and Franzelin has the greatest difficulty in squaring his view with theirs. He has become almost incapable of a fair rendering, though he sins in transparent honesty, sometimes giving his text with perfect

¹ *Considerations on Eucharistic Worship, or True and False Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, by the Rev. J. R. Milne, M.A.

good faith. Thus, on p. 28 he quotes the Conc. Trid., that the priesthood of the Church was established '*quia per mortem sacerdotium ejus extinguendum non erat*,' and renders this in the text '*in order that His own heavenly priesthood might not be extinguished.*' On this rendering he builds up a whole charge of falsehood against the Tridentine doctrine, as opposed to the Epistle to the Hebrews. On one point I think he goes wrong from pure ignorance. He does not understand the meaning of *representation*. He can think only of what you might call *histrionic representation*, where, of course, the *representative action* is essentially different from the *action represented*, and merely resembles it, and recalls it more or less faithfully. He has apparently never heard of *real representation*, which is precisely that continuation of the action represented for which he is contending. As he refers to Cienfuegos, he ought to have known that Cienfuegos maintains that the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of the Cross are *unum numero*, i.e., essentially one, not merely by virtue of *substantial identity*, but as having *actual identity*. And this is precisely his own thesis. He might have learnt the real meaning of representation from Andrewes, if he is too suspicious of 'Roman' authorities.

The book is a sad outcome of that temper which more than anything else bars the way to unity, and the temper which refuses to see in 'Roman' teaching and practice any meaning but that which is imported on the one hand by the crude popular understanding—the *vulgo dicebatur* of the Articles—and on the other, by the extravagances of hyper-subtle speculation.

In this connection the Bishop of Springfield, U.S.A.,¹ after thanking me for my efforts on behalf of reunion, and assuring me of his most sincere and cordial sympathy on all I was doing, reminded me that 'the question proposed to the two Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1534 was "Hath the Bishop of Rome by divine right (*jure divino*) any more jurisdiction within this realm of England than any other foreign bishop?" To this the answer was, with only a few exceptions, "No." Among the negatives were Bonner, Gardiner, etc.'

In reply to this Mr. Lacey wrote:—

¹ Rt. Rev. George Franklin Seymour, consecrated 11th June 1878; died 8th December 1906.

I think the answer to the Bishop's letter is that the discussion has in the past turned on the question of the Papal jurisdiction in the narrowest sense of the word, the jurisdiction of the *Court of Rome*, the jurisdiction which in its most characteristic features originated with the False Decretals. This is certainly what the Convocations of 1534 had before them, and upon this the whole controversy of the English Church in the sixteenth century turned, as indeed did that of the Gallicans in the seventeenth. The Gallicans found—rightly no doubt—the first origin of this jurisdiction in the Sardican Canon of Appeals. Therefore it was *de jure ecclesiastico*. But no one doubts that long before the Council of Sardica the Popes were invested with a primacy of a very large kind, which was indeed the reason for the appeal to Rome first allowed at Sardica. And this primacy was something more than one of *dignity* or *honour*. It was—to use the widest possible term—a primacy of *government*. (I would Latinise this by the word *regimen*.) Yet we cannot see that it involved any actual *potestas*. You have therefore described it as a primacy of *auctoritas*. Now this *auctoritas* of Rome has never been properly analysed by historians or theologians, because they have been universally occupied with the later ideas of Papal jurisdiction. The noteworthy fact about it is that its origin cannot be traced to any act of the whole Church which could be posited as its source *jure ecclesiastico*. It might indeed be referred to an ecclesiastical origin by force of custom, '*mos pro lege*,' but then the custom should be shown to have grown up gradually, or should be accounted for. In the absence of any such account of its origin, it may reasonably be referred to divine appointment, to an instruction originally committed to the Church by our Lord Himself. Then the question arises, whether any indications of such teaching can be found in the New Testament. No direct assertion of it, of course, is found, and not a little is found that seems to militate against it. On the other hand, there is the special charge confided more than once to St. Peter, which will certainly bear the interpretation of such a concession of *auctoritas*. This again may have been transmissible, and may have been transmitted to the Bishop whom St. Peter (no doubt with the concurrence of St. Paul) constituted at Rome, and to his successors.

Here is a reasonable, probable, though far from certain account of the origin of the Papal *auctoritas* which we find in existence in the earliest ages.

Now, if we find that the admission of this *auctoritas* would not in any way run counter to the divinely given *potestas* of the Episcopate, and if such admission would help to bring us into line with the rest of the Church, it seems to be our duty to admit as at least a probable opinion its existence *de jure divino*, and as far as possible to regulate our action accordingly.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, 19 octobre 1895.

Le Congrès à Norwich a été très bien. Tout le monde était de bonne humeur. Le doyen¹ de Norwich n'était pas méchant du tout, quoique d'après les journaux il s'en donnât bien l'air. Personne n'a osé dire que la réunion ne serait pas une bonne chose en elle-même, tout dépendait des . . . conditions ; le fait est que pour la plupart des gens, c'est la manière de dire qui importe beaucoup plus que la chose dite—on peut faire beaucoup avec un choix de mots. Comme j'ai dit à M. Ward hier, pourquoi le cardinal veut-il à tout prix et à chaque instant se servir du mot 'suprématie' ? La primauté telle que Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ l'a voulue exprime la même idée, et personne n'y trouve à redire. Mais il n'est pas adroit, notre cardinal. Toute la question est, ici, l'accord des droits du Pape et des droits de l'Episcopat ; quels sont les rapports qui doivent exister *nécessairement* entre le chef et les membres ? quels sont les droits qui, existants à tel ou tel époque, mais n'étant que les droits accidentels, peuvent être amoindris ou agrandis d'après les circonstances, les temps et les besoins de l'Eglise ?

Il faut que vous insistiez sur les droits de l'Episcopat, sur l'impossibilité de séparer le Pape dans toute action dogmatique de l'Episcopat, et que nous, de notre côté, nous reconnaissons que le Pape a des droits que les autres évêques ne possèdent pas. Mais je vous prêche un sermon. Adieu, mon cher ami, l'œuvre repose sur vous, et ce que je fais n'est rien du tout.

Je suis très content que le discours de l'archevêque d'York vous ait plu.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

GARROWBY, 29 octobre 1895.

L'archevêque d'York me dit aujourd'hui qu'il est en correspondance avec le cardinal Vaughan au sujet d'un projet de loi

¹ The Very Rev. W. Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

sur l'enseignement religieux dans les Ecoles Nationales, et que dans une de ses lettres le cardinal lui dit des choses très aimables et très généreuses au sujet du discours que l'archevêque a prononcé à Norwich.

Le Baron von Hügel est très content du livre du chanoine Everest, et le *Tablet* est tout à fait gracieux dans un article sur mon discours à Norwich. La vraie tactique pour nous est de fermer les yeux sur toutes les choses désagréables qui peuvent être dites par évêques, cardinaux et autres, et de faire ressortir tout ce qui se dit de bon partout où on le trouve.

J'entrevois une ombre de jalousie parmi les vôtres ici au sujet d'une revue¹ française traitant de nos affaires. On m'a déjà dit que le père Sydney Smith et Dom Gasquet étaient bien suffisants pour ces questions-là.² La nature humaine se fourre un peu partout.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

HERONS GHYLL,

UCKFIELD, January 1, 1896.

I have had a most interesting letter from Von Hügel in Rome which some time I should like you to see. He proposes that he and I should write for M. Portal's review, and I hope that we may find this feasible, though we have to make some inquiries first.

With the same object of promoting good feeling between various sections of Englishmen, he and I and a few others interested in metaphysics are making a little society³ for that kind of discussion. Arthur Balfour has joined us, and is dining with us on the 24th to help in arranging details. But please keep this private until the society is actually launched. I knew it would interest you as it is an effort—though only among

¹ The proposed *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, the establishment of which took place about this time.

² A doubt, however, may be permitted on this subject. In a communication to the *Tablet* of 24 November 1894, Abbot Gasquet said:—'It is quite clear that this writer [M. Dalbus] . . . has not even mastered the A B C of his subject. He is ignorant, for example, of the actual forms used at Parker's consecration in 1559, and takes as such the altered ordinal of 1662.' How completely Abbot Gasquet was mistaken was demonstrated in a letter to the *Tablet* of 22 December 1894, headed 'L'Abbé Duchesne and Anglican Orders,' and signed 'R. B. Raffles.' Abbot Gasquet in a reply to that letter acknowledged his error, but the fact that he could fall into it is none the less evidence of the temper in which the Abbé Portal's work was examined.

³ The Synthetic Society.

specialists in philosophy—to find a meeting-ground for a common understanding. It is not exactly on the basis of you and Portal, but it will help in the goodwill and good feeling which I know you recognise, as I do, as so important. Hügel himself will not be at home until the spring. He tells me Duchesne has been asked to be select preacher of the Epiphany sermons in Rome, and to preach on ‘reunion.’ This is very significant. I really do think that among us things are moving very fast towards a broad and sympathetic temper. Hügel has never written so hopefully on this subject, and he is in the way of hearing a great deal from the most authoritative sources.

I am busied in documents of 1850 (the Papal Aggression) for use in Cardinal Wiseman’s *Life*. Certainly the contrast between 1850 and 1895 is striking, and speaks much of increased openness of mind all round.

Hügel says that Portal’s review is read by all the Roman authorities, so that what we wish to come before them, we should send to it.

A letter from the Abbé Portal of about this date says :—

Le Pape a fait demander à Mgr. Gasparri 10 exemplaires de sa brochure.¹ Celui-ci va encore modifier son travail, mais seulement dans un sens favorable. La question des Ordres va être poussée à fond probablement. Les travaux de Boudinhon et Gasparri me paraissent de première importance en ce sens, que la conclusion forcée est que la pratique de l’église romaine à votre endroit doit être changée. Gasquet et Bishop entameront difficilement cette conclusion.²

Writing in regard to this Mr. Lacey says :—

Gasparri’s pamphlet is most interesting. It is as you say a step, and it is a long one. It is, of course, far enough from bringing him into line with us, even on this one topic, but it

¹ *De la Valeur des Ordinations Anglicanes*, Paris, 1895.

² This statement is endorsed by an entry in Dom Gasquet’s *Diary*, of 6th February : ‘I hear to-day from Rome that I shall probably be wanted soon, as the Pope speaks of appointing the long-talked-of Commission almost at once. Duchesne is said to have given out his determination to work so as to have the question of Anglican Ordinations settled apart from the historical setting of facts, and hence many, I am told, now think in Rome that a direction to hold re-ordination *sub-conditione* will be the final result of such a restricted inquiry.’ In other words, that the invalidity of English Ordinations would be determined by their historical setting.

would be unreasonable to expect that all at once. There is the *practice* of three hundred years to consider, and the necessity of accounting for that practice. Gasparri seems inclined to base it on an understanding of Paul iv.'s brief, which he admits to be theologically unsound. I think his interpretation is forced, but that is not to say that it was not the one accepted at the time or soon after. Even more interesting is his admission that he fell into his former blunder of accepting the Nag's Head story by blindly following the current teaching of the Roman schools. This is most valuable in face of certain recent denials of that current teaching.

It seems to me that the pith of his argument is this :

(a) The rites for presbyteral and diaconal ordination are theologically doubtful, but they were accepted as valid by Paul iv.

(b) The rite for episcopal consecration was rejected as invalid by Paul iv., but it is probably valid on theological grounds.

(c) Either decision of Paul iv. may be revised ; but until it is revised his decision (b) rules the practice.

Mr. Birkbeck was at this time in Russia, where the question of reunion was also exciting attention. In a letter written early in the year, he says how warmly Janysheff, the Court chaplain, at a luncheon at the Winter Palace, had spoken of ' the English Church and the Archbishop of Canterbury ; how they welcomed English Churchmen coming amongst them, and that any step which was taken in the direction of drawing the two Churches together must receive the blessing of Him Who prayed that there might be one fold and one Shepherd.'

Mr. Birkbeck went on to say :—

I have had two long interviews with the Metropolitan Palladius of St. Petersburg, the President of the Holy Synod, and he was most kind and very keen indeed about reunion with the English Church : not at all, however, for reunion with Rome, which he says cannot be thought of until the Pope will acknowledge a General Council to be a higher authority than himself : as long, he says, as Rome will not acknowledge this, the Eastern Church cannot even discuss the subject, as from their point of view, it is an abnegation of any belief in the Church at all, and they have no common ground to begin upon, any more than with German Protestantism, which likewise rejects the authority of the Church

in favour of the private interpretation of the Christian Faith either by individuals, or the heads of States. 'But,' he said, 'I have examined the writings of English theologians, and they do acknowledge the authority of General Councils, as a principle, and through mutual explanations, we might agree as to what Councils we acknowledge : while the Seven Sacraments, I find, are not denied by the English Church, but only a distinction is drawn between the two which are necessary for all men, while the others, such as marriage and the priesthood, are certainly not necessary for all. Our Church, indeed, says that confession is necessary before Communion, but I find that your Church orders a general confession before each Communion, which shows that the principle is not rejected by you. I think that this might, after all, be regarded as a matter of local discipline, and so also the question of married bishops, which certainly existed, though very seldom, in the early Church.'

These were, roughly, his words. He then went on to say that it was most important that the question of our Orders should be investigated in Russia, and, if possible, favourably decided : as he quite saw that the English bishops could never admit their Orders to be invalid, and if this were not settled favourably there seemed to be no chance of reunion, but if it were, there ought to be no difficulty if our bishops really wished for unity.

In a later letter Mr. Birkbeck writes :—

Bishop Wilkinson is now in Russia confirming. He arrived here on Thursday, and asked me to go with him to pay a visit to the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg.

On Friday morning we visited the Metropolitan in the Laura of St. Alexander Nevski. The Metropolitan was quite charming to him, and after the usual salutations and interchange of compliments, said, 'What we should like is that the authorities of the English Church should address themselves to the Holy Synod direct ; we wish for unity, and pray for it, but we do not know one another. I find now that the Anglican Church is quite different to what we were always accustomed to believe. If the authorities of the two Churches, neither of which has the slightest desire to rule over the other, but only, as our Saviour Himself prayed, to be in unity, could only get to know one another better, even if difficulties appeared, it would only require goodwill and Christian charity, and God would show us

the way to remove them.' The bishop then asked the Metropolitan whether, supposing the Archbishop of Canterbury were to invite a Russian bishop to the Lambeth Conference next year, they would send one. The Metropolitan said that if the invitation were addressed to the Holy Synod, he was sure they would; he, as presiding member, should be strongly in favour of it, and he had already talked over the question of sending a Russian bishop to visit England, as the reception of Bishop Nicholas¹ last autumn had already produced such a good effect in Russia.

Other letters passed between Mr. Birkbeck and myself, with the result that I ventured to write to the late King, then Prince of Wales, as to one of the English bishops attending the forthcoming Coronation of the Czar. I have the King's permission to print the following letter which I received in reply :—

The Prince of Wales to Lord Halifax

CANNES, 29th March 1896.

Many thanks for your letter of the 26th. I entirely share your views and those of Mr. Birkbeck that it would be an excellent thing if one of our bishops attended the Coronation at Moscow in May. Some time ago I mentioned the subject to my brother,² who is to represent the Queen, and he spoke to her on the subject. The names of the Bishops of Winchester and Peterborough were mentioned. The Queen seemed to have no objection, but did not think it would be advisable for them to go out in my brother's suite.

I should have thought if the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Lord Salisbury on the subject, it would be a very good thing. I hope to see him in a few days, and will mention the subject to him—anyhow it will give me great pleasure to see Mr. Birkbeck on my return home, and hear his impressions of Russia.

I add here, though out of date, a concluding letter from Mr. Birkbeck, giving an account of the Czar's Coronation and the Bishop of Peterborough's visit to Russia.

¹ Bishop of Alaska. He had visited England on his way to America. There was at that time only one Russian Bishop in the United States, who took the title of Alaska, but whose *Cathedra* was at San Francisco.

² The Duke of Connaught.

Mr. W. J. Birkbeck to Lord Halifax

HOTEL D'EUROPE, ST. PETERBURG,
June 15/27, 1896.

I arrived here on Thursday from Moscow. As far as the Bishop of Peterborough at the Coronation is concerned, I think he was a great success. He was full of tact and *savoir faire*; and all the Russians, from the Emperor downwards, who saw him, seemed to be thoroughly pleased. He dined twice with, and was received twice besides, by the Emperor. Pobedonostzeff and he mutually appreciated each other, as I always knew they would. The Russians everywhere expressed their gratification at the fact that the English Church had made such a striking new departure, and the Archbishop's letters, both to the Metropolitan and to Pobedonostzeff, were exactly the right thing, and have given great satisfaction. Last week, when I was in Moscow, the Metropolitan sent the reply address, which he is sending in the name of the Holy Synod to the Archbishop, to the Rumiantzeff Museum to be illuminated, and yesterday Pobedonostzeff gave it to me, and asked me to take it to England, while he himself is going to write to the Archbishop, and has asked me to spend the afternoon to-morrow in the country with him, and to furnish him with hints as to the Archbishop's titles, etc., so as to make his letter as acceptable as possible.

The Bishop of Peterborough was a charming companion, and I hope didn't get bored with me; I certainly didn't with him, although in our discussions on matters in general we didn't always agree. As far as Russia was concerned, he was most appreciative. He preached two excellent sermons in the English Church, especially one on Trinity Sunday, in which he talked about worship, and said how that the English in Russia, even if they saw around them modes of worship to which they were not accustomed, might at least learn a lesson from a nation which so evidently put the worship of God, whether in the streets, or in their houses, or in their churches, before everything else, and expressed in that worship all the articles of the Christian faith in better proportion than any other Church in Christendom. These certainly are my sentiments, but I never expected to hear an English bishop express them: it was so refreshing to be with a man who wasn't shocked at imaginary idolatries, but who tried to put a good construction upon everything he saw. It was most gratifying to me to see how the

charm of Moscow grew upon him, until he became almost as enthusiastic as I am. He was delighted with Pobedonostzeff, who, he said, was the only statesman whom he had ever met, with definite principles, upon which, whether they were right or wrong, all his actions were evidently based.

As for myself, I have been more than well treated. As I told you before I left, there was a difficulty about my getting into the Cathedral for the actual Coronation, as the place which Pobedonostzeff had secured for me had to be given up to the bishop. However, the day before the public entry into Moscow, the Emperor asked Pobedonostzeff whether I had come, and when he heard I had, he said, 'I am very glad, and I hope he will see everything as well as possible.' Armed with this, Pobedonostzeff went to the Kremlin to Prince Dolgoruki, who had the arrangement of the places, and said that I *must* be provided with a good place, and I ended by having quite the best in the whole Cathedral, about twenty yards in front of the Emperor and the two Empresses, from where I could see, not only nearly every one in the church (except part of the diplomatic body), but the whole front of the screen, where all the ceremonial took place, as well as the doorway where the Emperor and all the processions entered from the Kremlin yard. It was a wonderful occasion, and I think few even of the foreigners who were there got through the service with perfectly dry eyes or without an occasional gulp in their throats. The arrival of the widowed Empress, alone, crowned and in the Imperial robes, amidst the guns and bells and wonderful cheers of the people, was the first great feature, and was quite heart-rending; but her bravery, both when she was received at the door by the ecclesiastics and went to salute the eicons, and when she took her place, was perfectly astonishing. Then, about forty minutes after, the Emperor and Empress arrived. They were received outside the door by the three Metropolitans, and the clergy, and were sprinkled with holy water and kissed the cross; after which they came in and went the round to the eicons of the Saviour and the Mother of God, while the huge choir sang quite softly, 'My song shall be of mercy and judgment.' And then, when from the rather stilted, grandiloquent phraseology of his speeches in the third person to the Emperor, the Metropolitan suddenly changed to the ordinary language of a father to a son: 'What dost thou believe?' And the Emperor recited the Nicene Creed, standing there in the middle

of the church in front of his throne, quite quietly, and yet so clearly and distinctly that every word could be heard all over the church. It really was magnificent.

The Duke of Connaught was a great success here : everybody seemed to like him, and he had such a particularly nice suite with him, every one of which was thoroughly popular with the Russians. Of course it wasn't quite the same thing as the Prince of Wales, whom people here know so much better, and were decidedly disappointed not to see at the Coronation, but still he certainly was one of, if not the *most*, popular of the foreign royalties. I need hardly say that I told every one all the nice things the Prince of Wales had said to me about Moscow. He is certainly very much liked here ; one could see that by the way every one was pleased at his winning the Derby. I don't know how many people at the big Kremlin ball, which took place the day after, didn't mention it to me : they seemed quite as pleased as the English about it.

I saw Agliardi,¹ but only for a short talk : he was pleased with the Russians, and in some respects very envious, but expressed himself shocked at 'superstitions' connected with the eicons. He said some very nice things about English piety, etc., etc., and talked about how he had travelled on English ships, and had seen young men at the service on Sundays, etc., etc., but he was absolutely ignorant upon our ecclesiastical matters. I only saw him the day he was leaving. My interview with him was cut short by the arrival of Izvoljski² (to whom I introduced you in Rome), to take leave of him. He was evidently much concerned about the Bishop of Peterborough, and asked how it had all come about. I told him that it was simply the result of the reunion spirit now awakened in the English Church, and that though actual reunion might at present be far distant, it would come some day — perhaps sooner than many people thought—and in the meantime we were determined to avail ourselves of any opportunity of removing obstacles and misunderstandings, whether in respect to the East or to the West. He was just beginning to talk about the commission at Rome about our Orders, when Izvoljski arrived, and I had only time to say a word or two about our gratitude to Leo XIII. for what he had done in the matter.

¹ The Envoy from the Pope.

² Russian Minister at Rome, accredited to the Vatican, late Minister of Foreign Affairs in Russia, and now Ambassador at Paris.

CHAPTER X

VISIT TO PARIS, AND CORRESPONDENCE UP TO MARCH 1896.

IN February 1896 I went to Paris in order to see the Abbé Portal, who had wished me to meet various persons interested in the cause of reunion.

On arriving at 95 rue de Sèvres, the headquarters and central house of the Lazarist Community, I was presented to the Superior, and after dinner in the Refectory, had a long conversation with the Abbé, who expressed himself as more than satisfied with the success so far attained by the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, of the effect which Father Puller's articles in the *Revue* were producing, and of the sympathetic and general interest which the cause of reunion was exciting among both clergy and laity in France and elsewhere. The next morning the house began to stir about 4 A.M., the first Mass being said before five. The chapel is a large building in the classical style, consisting of a nave divided from the aisles by a long row of columns. There are galleries over the aisles, accessible from the first floor, a long, wide choir, capable of holding three or four hundred persons, separated by an iron grille from a space at the west end of the church reserved for the public. On either side of this space there are two chapels, one dedicated to the Passion, the other more particularly to the Agony of our Lord in the Garden. Behind, and somewhat above the High Altar, is the shrine in which is preserved the body of St. Vincent de Paul. The chapel was full at seven o'clock. The community and all the young men were in surplices, the effect very much that of Christ Church, Keble College, or Trinity College, Cambridge. Nearly every one communicated, the young men coming

up in two rows and kneeling in front of the altar by threes. It was a very moving and touching sight, as there must have been at least one hundred and fifty or two hundred who made their Communions.

There was coffee in the Refectory at eight, and at a quarter past nine I received a visit from Mgr. d'Hulst, the head of the Catholic Institute, who is one of the only two ecclesiastics who are members of the Chamber of Deputies. He was confessor to the Comte de Paris, is very intimate with all the Orleans family, and one of the most leading ecclesiastics in Paris. In appearance, except that he is taller, he might almost be mistaken for the late Dean of Chichester.¹ Mgr. d'Hulst talked much as to the prospect of reunion—of the difficulties that beset the question, and of the hopes that might be entertained in regard to it. He then alluded to the discussion now going on as to the validity of English Orders, in reference to which he adverted to the opposition which the possibility of such recognition seemed to excite amongst members of the Roman Catholic communion in England, of which he seemed to have had evidence. He asked why it was, and whether it was partly due to the fear that any recognition of Anglican Orders by Rome would interfere with individual conversions, such conversions, as indeed Cardinal Vaughan had apparently stated more than once, seeming to them to be the only way in which reunion was likely to be brought about, and the only practical solution of the divisions of Christendom. I replied that I thought their attitude was influenced by such considerations, and that it was also a source of irritation that the question should have been taken up by members of the French clergy, but that even from the point of view of what was likely to promote or hinder conversions, there was another side to the question; that I believed in many cases a recognition of the validity of our Orders, and therefore of the reality of our Sacraments, was likely to have the opposite effect to that which was supposed. No doubt the recognition of our Orders might operate in some cases as the English Roman

¹ The Very Rev. Richard William Randall.

Catholics apprehended, but in others, I had reason to know, it was likely to have just the opposite effect. Apart from this, to look to individual conversions as the only means of bringing England back into visible communion with the Holy See was tantamount to saying such a return was hopeless. Individual conversions were, after all, few and far between, unappreciable, and perfectly insignificant in reference to the great mass of the population. No one in their senses could doubt that England as a whole, if it was to be won back at all, could only be won back through the Church of England; and, in my opinion, Cardinal Vaughan, if he really desired reunion, ought to desire nothing so much as any action which might influence the Church of England as a whole to consider the renewal of relations with Rome, and should therefore encourage efforts such as the present, which, in fact, were directed to that end. I added that, great as the difficulties were from a human point of view, I believed they were not insurmountable. Dr. Pusey and others had pointed out that there were no irreconcilable differences between the Decrees of the Council of Trent and the Formularies of the English Church. In regard even to the Vatican Council, it seemed every day becoming clearer that the effect of the Decree as to Papal Infallibility had been exaggerated on both sides; and though, after all explanations had been given, grave difficulties would remain, there was at least such a possibility of explanation, and so much to be done in the direction of peace, that the duty of working for reunion was imperative on all who had the welfare of the Church at heart.

Mgr. d'Hulst called again in the afternoon, and was followed by Dr. Ferrand, one of the leading physicians in Paris and President of the Academy of St. Luke, a society of doctors, scientific men, and others, having for its special object the pursuit of medical and scientific study in subordination to Christian doctrine and practice. Dr. Ferrand is one of the contributors to the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. He expressed the greatest interest in the subject of reunion, begging that I would, if possible,

spend an evening at his house in order that I might meet some of those with whom he was connected, and give them all the information I could on the subject. Dr. Ferrand had scarcely gone before M. Lorin arrived. M. Lorin was intimate with Cardinal Rampolla, and with some of the American bishops, Mgr. Ireland amongst them. He was much interested in all ecclesiastical and social affairs, and was supposed to have contributed to the attitude taken by Leo XIII. in regard to French politics. He was also deeply interested in reunion, and anxious to do all he could to further it. He spoke at some length upon the necessity of avoiding exaggeration, as exaggeration always led to disappointment, of the importance of people in France being convinced that there was a real desire in England for reunion, and that it was not merely the desire of some eccentric Englishman, *e.g.*, that it was not merely the voice of Lord Halifax, '*clamantis in deserto.*' This, I gathered, was what had been asserted in some quarters by persons who, so I inferred from what he and others said, would not have been sorry to see a stop put to the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*.

Later in the morning the Abbé and I called on the Duc de Broglie, who expressed his interest in the cause of reunion, talked of Cardinal Manning's life, and promised to come to the informal meeting organised by the Abbé in the afternoon. Dinner was at twelve, and very much resembled the dinner in the hall of Keble College—six long tables the length of the refectory, with three tables cross-ways at the top of the hall, one for the Superior-General, at which he dined in company with two poor men, the second for any guests, and the third for certain members of the community. The waiting was done by the lay brothers, silence being observed at all the meals.

After dinner we called on M. Levé, the editor of the *Monde*, a newspaper which has taken a special and intelligent interest in everything connected with the subject of reunion; and at five we returned for the meeting above alluded to. The first to arrive were the Duc de Broglie and the Comte de Richemont, the latter of whom had been

much interested and a little startled by the comments in the *Spectator* on a recent sermon of Mr. Gore's at Cambridge—he was also acquainted, if I understood him correctly, with Mr. Wilfrid Ward, Baron von Hügel, and others. These were followed by two Dominicans representing the Superior from the Convent in the Rue du Bac, who had been prevented from coming himself, the Père Ragey, a Marist and author of a small book on the state of religion in England; several members of the religious body which owns the very influential and widely-spread paper, *La Croix*; the Père Tournebize, a Jesuit, who writes in the *Etudes Religieuses*; Mgr. d'Hulst, and many of the professors of the Catholic Institute, including the Abbé Klein and the Abbé Boudinhon, whose articles on English Orders had excited attention; M. Ollé Lapruné, extracts from whose interesting work on philosophical questions, religious matters, and persons in France had been published in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*; M. Fonsegrive, the author of the *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne* and *D'un Curé de Canton*, so much recommended by the Bishop of Lincoln; M. Viollet and M. E. Senart, members of the Institut de France; the editors of all the leading ecclesiastical papers—the *Univers*, the *Vérité*, the *Monde*, the *Quinzaine*; M. Lavedan, of the *Correspondant*; M. Arthur Loth, the Abbé Batiffol, M. H. Lorin; some of the clergy of S. Sulpice, and others; in short, representatives of the leading ecclesiastical thought in Paris. It was not an easy matter to speak in French without any preparation before such an audience, but as the Abbé said: *Quand on est à l'eau, il faut nager*, and I did my best.

Mgr. Hulst opened the conversation by saying they had come for an interchange of ideas and for information, and also to express their sense of all that was being done in England on behalf of the great cause of the reunion of Christendom which they had all so much at heart. He then alluded to the conversation we had had in the morning, and asked if I would repeat what I had said to him as to the apparent irritation and annoyance evinced by English Roman Catholics at the action of the Abbé Portal and others. I began by saying that the last time

I had seen Cardinal Newman I had discussed the question of the possibility of reunion with him, and he had then said I should probably find more sympathy among the French clergy than among the English, and had advised me to interest them in the subject. I now perceived how true his words were, and desired to avail myself of the present occasion, not only to thank such clergy as might be present, but also to thank the representatives of the French press, for the sympathetic interest they had taken in the subject. As to the annoyance felt in England, indicated by the correspondence in the *Tablet*, I believed it was chiefly due to the feeling that foreign ecclesiastics were not likely to be as well informed on such subjects as Englishmen, and to the fear that what was being done might have the effect of stopping individual conversions. In regard to the first of these apprehensions, it might be answered that it was not without its advantages to have the subject considered by those who, from their situation, were outside those personal considerations which almost necessarily complicated its consideration in England; and in regard to the second, though no doubt any recognition of the validity of English Orders might hinder conversions in some cases, in my opinion, and in that of many persons much better informed than myself, it was probable that in others—and a much larger number—it would have just the opposite effect: well-informed members of the Church of England were prepared to recognise their shortcomings, and were quite aware how far the Anglican communion, as a whole, fell short in practice of the standard held up by the Book of Common Prayer; but the one thing they never could and never would do was to admit a doubt as to the reality of the Sacraments they had received—their Communion, their Absolutions, since to do so would be to deny the spiritual experience of a lifetime. A word of caution was, however, necessary. Members of the Church of England had no right to find fault with members of the Roman communion for wishing to encourage individual conversions; it was, indeed, the necessary consequence of their position; but, on the other hand, it was not a work

in which it was possible for loyal members of the Church of England to sympathise, believing as they did that God had given them duties to perform where they were. This led to a remark from the Abbé Portal, that, after all, so far as the recognition of the validity of English Orders was concerned, it was a question, not of expediency, but of right and justice, and if they were valid, that validity ought to be recognised whatever the consequences. This seemed to meet with general approval. I then went on to say that, great as the difficulties were in the way of peace, difficulties which from a human point of view might seem almost insurmountable, I believed peace was possible without compromise of principle on either side, if both sides really desired it, and were prepared to allow a wide latitude as to everything which was not strictly *de fide*—about such things, of course, there could be no compromise, though there might be large explanations. Cardinal Newman in Tract 90, Dr. Pusey, Bishop Forbes of Brechin, and other Anglican theologians of acknowledged authority, had always maintained that it was possible to reconcile the authoritative formularies of the Church of England with the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and that even in regard to the position claimed for the Pope by the Vatican Council, it was beginning to be recognised that the effect of the Decree had been largely exaggerated on both sides, and that it might perhaps be shown that the infallibility claimed for the Pope was in reality nothing else than the infallibility of the Church. In any case enough had been said on the subject to show that there was a possibility of explanation, and, if so, the duty of attempting it. In view of the ignorances and prejudices which beset the question on both sides, I thought there was everything to be gained by discussion and personal conference. Nothing dissipated prejudices and misunderstanding so much as meeting face to face. In conclusion, I begged those present to believe that in bringing forward the question of Orders there had been no desire to strengthen the position of the Church of England as against Rome: entertaining, as we did, no doubt as to their validity, this could not be

our object. The question had been brought forward solely because it afforded the most convenient and easy ground upon which to inaugurate a discussion which had the reunion of Christendom for its end. Our one and only desire was to promote the peace and reunion of Christendom, and in regard to the conditions upon which such peace could be secured, to follow our Lord's Will, and not our own.

This led to much conversation, all of a most friendly and encouraging nature. Among other things, it was asked what were the points in the decrees of the Council of Trent which would occasion the greatest difficulty, and with which it would be hardest to reconcile the English formularies. I replied that I thought the real difficulties did not lie so much with anything in the formularies themselves as in the opinions outside the formularies which prevailed amongst us, and in the very serious divisions which existed within the Church of England. Something was then said as to the present position of the question touching the validity of English Orders, and I was asked whether, supposing a case was made out for a change in what had been the practice of the Roman Church for the last three hundred years—a change which in itself would be a fact of capital importance—and it could be shown that there was no reason to doubt from a historical and scientific point of view the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church, the English clergy would consent to a conditional and supplementary ordination in order to remove any sort of theological doubt which might still be urged. Either then, or by Mgr. Gasparri later, it was pointed out that this was the universal practice of the Roman Church in regard to her own members, and that though the imposition of hands and prayer indicative of the intention to confer Holy Orders were generally accepted as the necessary form and matter of the Sacrament of Order, still, if by any mistake or inadvertence any ordinand omitted to touch the Chalice or Paten, which *ex hypothesi* was not necessary for a valid ordination, the possible defect was remedied by a conditional re-ordination.¹ I replied, speaking, however,

¹ See Gasparri, *De Sac. Ord.*, vol. ii. p. 261.

only for myself, that I thought, if all other difficulties had been removed, and it was made clear that by no possible implication the English clergy could be held to be casting any sort of doubt upon their own position, it would be their duty, and that of all in an analogous position, for the sake of peace and charity, and for so great a good as the reunion of Christendom, to consent to any step which did not compromise a truth and a position they were bound to defend. This was welcomed with applause.

M^{gr}. d'Hulst next asked whether the reunion I hoped for was based on the recognition of the Pope as Patriarch of the West, or as the Primate of the whole of Christendom, *jure ecclesiastico* ; or whether it was a union based on the recognition of the Pope as Primate of Christendom by virtue of our Lord's appointment, so that the only question would be as to the extent of the powers involved in such Primacy. I replied that, speaking again for myself, I had no hesitation in saying that I looked for the reunion of Christendom on the basis of a recognition of the Primacy of the Holy See by virtue of our Lord's appointment, and so *ex jure divino* ; that the whole question lay in deciding what such Primacy involved, and here came in the importance of a careful discussion of the *auctoritas* claimed for the Pope, and what were the limits which could be assigned to it. It was no doubt true that Dr. Pusey, who had seen several of the French bishops in order to interest them in the cause of reunion before the Vatican Council, had, after the Council, ceased from any further efforts in that direction, feeling such endeavours, at all events for the moment, to be hopeless ; but even here time seemed to be showing that the effect of the Vatican Decree had been exaggerated on both sides. If it could be demonstrated that Papal Infallibility, as had been stated to be the case, was, in fact, merely the infallibility of the Church, no action of the Pope apart from the Church as represented by the Episcopate being contemplated by the Decree, then it would certainly appear that a basis for explanation existed, which might make peace possible. The Church of England had never denied the Primacy of the Holy See, and, to come to particulars,

I believed there would be a general desire in England to admit any claims made on its behalf which could justify themselves by an appeal to history, and the general traditions and practice of the whole Church. In order to appreciate the true character of what took place in England in the sixteenth century, it was necessary to take into account the consequences of the great Schism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the line taken at the Councils of Constance and Basle. The position taken up in England did not materially differ from that involved in the Pragmatic Sanction in France, or even very much from what was implied later on in the Declaration of Bossuet and the French clergy in the seventeenth century. The denial of the jurisdiction¹ of the Court of Rome, which was the question before the English Convocations in 1534, did not necessarily involve a denial of the authority² of the Apostolic See, but the course of events had afterwards complicated matters on both sides. On the side of England, changes in the doctrine and ritual of the Church, mainly through foreign influences, had prejudiced the position of the English Church in the eyes of those who wished to adhere to the old order of things. On the side of Rome, a policy which might have justified itself in the days of Gregory VII., or of Innocent III., when the interference of the Spiritual Power in temporal matters was acquiesced in by every one, could only, in the condition of things engendered by the Renaissance, have the effect of still further alienating the country from a power which it found invoking the assistance of foreign powers against itself. Such a policy could only be justified by success. It had failed, and it was therefore condemned. I did not allude to these things in order to justify all that had been done by those responsible for the changes in England, but in order to show that, in view of the great need of reform admitted on all sides, in view also of the

¹ Jurisdiction in the sense of coercive authority with power to determine such matters as then went by appeal from the English to the Roman Courts, and to require the enforcement of such decisions.

² In the sense of such authority—based on our Lord's commission to St. Peter—as from very early times history showed had been exercised by the Papacy in the affairs of the Church.

fact that it was largely owing to the action of the Popes that such reform had not been undertaken till it was too late, the consequences of the Schism could not, in justice, be made to fall only on one side. On the contrary, all should be ready to accept their share of the consequences, and all should endeavour to remedy evils for which all were responsible. If we had much to gain by reunion with the Roman Church, we in England were accustomed to think the Roman Church had also something to gain from the readmission of the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon element within its fold. Some one, after this, raised the question of the marriage of the clergy, but it was at once put on one side as one of discipline, while in regard to prayers for the dead, which were also mentioned, I said there could be no sort of difficulty. The conversation lasted about two hours. The extremely sympathetic attitude and friendly feeling of all present was unmistakable, while even more remarkable was the fact that so many persons, representing such very different opinions—as, for example, those of the *Univers* and *Vérité* on one side, and the *Correspondant* on the other—should have come together at so short and informal a notice, and been able to meet on the common ground of goodwill to the Church of England, and a desire to promote, by all means in their power, the reunion of Christendom.

On Saturday morning the Abbé Boudinhon, the Abbé Klein, and M. Tavernier, of the *Univers*, came to see me, and on Sunday, after Mass, which was sung at seven, I had another long and interesting conversation with the Abbé Boudinhon and Mgr. Gasparri, the importance of whose articles in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, on the Validity of English Orders and on the Jurisdiction of the Holy See, in reference to the Episcopate, is generally admitted. It is difficult to vouch for the entire accuracy of an account of conversation written down from memory; but I believe the following to be substantially a correct summary of what passed. On the subject of the claims made on behalf of the Pope, I ventured, recapitulating much which has already appeared in the correspondence,¹ to ask the Abbé

¹ See Mr. Lucey's letters, pp. 234 and 236.

Boudinhon whether in the past the discussion of those claims had not, for the most part at least, turned on the question of jurisdiction in the narrowest sense of the word—the jurisdiction, that is, of the Court of Rome. It seemed to me that this was the case, to some extent, even in his articles, and that this jurisdiction, which in its most characteristic features originated with the False Decretals, was what the English Convocations of 1534 had before them, and that upon this the whole controversy of the English Church in the sixteenth century turned, as, indeed, did that of the Gallican Church in the seventeenth. The Gallicans found, rightly no doubt, the first origin of this jurisdiction in the Sardican Canon of Appeals; therefore it was *de jure ecclesiastico*; but no one in England would deny (1) that long before the Council of Sardica the Popes were invested with a Primacy of a very large kind, which was, indeed, the reason for the appeal to Rome first allowed at Sardica; and (2) that this Primacy was something more than one of dignity or honour. It was, to use the widest possible term, a primacy of *government*, which might be expressed by the Latin term *regimen*, yet we could not see that it involved any actual *potestas*. I should therefore venture to describe the Pope's Primacy as one of *auctoritas*. Further, I thought that this *auctoritas* of Rome had never been properly analysed by historians or theologians in reference to existing controversies, for the reason that they had been universally occupied with the later idea of Papal jurisdiction. The noteworthy fact about it, however, was that its origin could not be traced to any act of the whole Church, which could be alleged as its source *jure ecclesiastico*. No doubt it might be referred to an ecclesiastical origin by force of custom, *mos pro lege*, but then the custom should be shown to have grown up gradually, or should be accounted for. In the absence of any such account of its origin, it might reasonably be referred to Divine appointment—to an instruction originally committed to the Church by our Lord Himself. The question would then arise, whether any indications of such teaching were to be found in the New Testament.

No direct assertion of it is found, and not a little which might seem to militate against it ; but on the other hand, there is the special charge confided to St. Peter, which would certainly bear the interpretation of such a conception of *auctoritas*. This, again, may have been transmissible, and may have been transmitted to the bishop whom St. Peter (no doubt with the concurrence of St. Paul) constituted at Rome, and to his successors. This was a reasonable, probable, though far from certain, account of the origin of the Papal *auctoritas* which we find exerted in the earliest ages. Now, if the admission of this *auctoritas* would not in any way run counter to the divinely given *potestas* of the Episcopate, and if such admission would help to bring the English Church into line with the rest of the West, it seemed to me our duty to admit, at least as a probable opinion, still more as a basis for conference and discussion, its existence *de jure divino*, and, as far as possible, regulate our attitude in regard to the cause of reunion and the claims of the Roman Church accordingly. The question, then, which I would ask the Abbé Boudinhon was, How did such a statement of the case strike him, and was it one which could be put forward with any reasonable hope that it might supply a basis for peace ? ¹

The Abbé replied, if I understood him aright, that he thought such a statement of the case was perfectly admissible, and that the terms *auctoritas* and *regimen* could be accepted, provided the former was not too much qualified by, and put into opposition to, *potestas*. History showed that the Popes had, from the earliest times, and in reference to every sort of subject, always claimed *authority* to intervene wherever the good of the Church seemed to require it.² But no doubt, the Abbé continued, the exer-

¹ It will be observed that I was here repeating the argument of Mr. Lacey's letter given above (p. 236). The subject was discussed in a letter which I addressed to the *Church Times* of 13th December 1895, and in articles by 'Ucalegon' and the Abbé Boudinhon, which appeared in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. i. pp. 339-357.

² This statement hardly differed from that in a published letter of Dean Church, (late Dean of St. Paul's), in which he had spoken of the time when 'the Pope, and he only, could represent the spiritual power with any reality, when every one assumed that the Pope was the rightful organ of the Church—that her power was gathered up in him.' See *Life of Cardinal Manning* (Purcell), vol. i. p. 698.

cise of such authority, and its extent in practice, depended on circumstances, and had varied from time to time. Sometimes it would have been more, and sometimes less. In the same way the consequences of being in opposition to it would also vary with the circumstances of each case. Obviously, if our Lord had instituted a Primacy and a visible centre of unity for His Church, churches out of visible communion with the Head could not be said to be in a normal condition, and there would evidently be something illegitimate in their position: the visible Head and the members ought to be united; but, on the other hand, assuming the validity of our Orders, to say that a Church like the Church of England, with its history and position, and in view of all the circumstances attaching to its particular case, was cut off from sacramental grace, and the sacramental channels dried up by reason of our separation from Rome, was a proposition which was absolutely false and contrary to all '*saine théologie*.' He added he should be quite prepared to write in this sense in the *Revue*.

We next had some conversation on Papal Infallibility, taking as a text the comment of the Archbishop of St. Louis, who, speaking of Archbishop Manning's speech at the Vatican Council, had said: '*Nullum dubium de Pontificis infallibilitate personali, separata et absoluta, aut ipse [Archbishop Manning] habet, aut aliis ut habeant permittere vult. Eam doctrinam esse fidei asserit.*' On this the Abbé said no doubt the infallibility asserted by the Council for the Successor of St. Peter was '*personalis*' and '*absoluta*' in regard to the deposit of the faith, as being real in itself, and not derived from others, but it could not be said to be '*separata*' from the Church, and, in fact, it would not be difficult to show that the Pope's infallibility was really nothing else than the infallibility of the Church itself. The Pope was bound, when proclaiming the belief of the Church in regard to any point touching faith or morals contained in the Deposit, to take all necessary means for ascertaining the faith of the Church, and though it could not be said that for this purpose one means could

be insisted upon as more necessary than another, the infallibility claimed for the Pope was strictly limited to the deposit of faith confided to the Church, and to attempt to establish any infallibility apart from the Church, or in separation from, and in opposition to, the witness of the Episcopate as to that faith, was not within the meaning and scope of the Vatican Decree. Mgr. Gasparri seemed to endorse the same view. He also observed, in regard to Father Puller's statements as to the meaning of the Thirty-first Article on the sacrifice of the Mass, that it was not so much what might have been the original meaning of some of those responsible for the Article in the first instance, which was of importance, as the interpretation put upon it by the Church of England at the present time.

In reference to the question of the validity of English Orders, Mgr. Gasparri said he had been asked by the Pope to send him some more copies of his treatise, adding that he had modified the conclusion in a sense more favourable to their absolute validity, in consequence of finding, amongst other things, that he had not allowed sufficient weight to the very wide conclusions of Cardinal de Lugo as to what was required to constitute a sufficient moral union between the imposition of hands and the consecratory prayer. He stated very clearly that, after reading everything on the subject, his conclusion was that there was absolutely no doubt as to the historical fact of Barlow's consecration, none as to the sufficiency of the intention, and the only question which could be raised was as to the sufficiency of the Rite. In regard to this he expressed considerable astonishment at the line taken in much of the argument in the *Tablet*, which seemed to him entirely beside the question. The Rite, he repeated again, presented the only difficulty. It was one, however, upon which he did not think fresh light was likely to be thrown, or in regard to which a conclusion different from the one asserted in his treatise was probable, and for this reason, that since no one could say exactly what were the essentials for valid Orders prescribed by our Lord, there would always be room for

theological opinions on the subject. In all such cases, where it was possible to raise any kind of doubt, it was the practice of the Roman Church, in order to guard against any such cavil, to use some supplementary and conditional ceremony, and he supposed that such was likely to be the decision, if any decision was given at all, in the present case.

After dinner, which was at twelve, we went to S. Sulpice, where I was introduced to the directors, and where I was afterwards asked to say a few words to them and the students. I did so, endeavouring to say something as to the position and principles of the English Church; of the work which had been done by the Oxford Movement, how wonderfully it had pleased God to bless the work of that Movement, bringing back, through its influence, principles and practice which, though always a part of the Church's authoritative teaching, had been partially obscured and neglected; how much reason there was to believe that by the blessing of God the Church of England, as M. de Maistre seemed to anticipate, might be destined to be an instrument for promoting the reunion of Christendom, and how earnestly I begged for their sympathy and prayers on behalf of endeavours which had for their sole object the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that His followers might be one.

I was asked a few questions as to the growth of religious communities in England, and at the close of my remarks, one of the directors, who had been at the gathering on the Friday evening, said how much he had been struck by all that had passed on that occasion, and in particular by one thing he had understood me to say, namely, that to deny the reality of the Sacraments received in the English Church would be to deny the reality of all our spiritual experiences. Before I came away I was asked if I would address the students the next time I was in Paris on the subject of reunion.

On Sunday evening, as, indeed, had been the case on Saturday, I saw some of the members of the community to which the Abbé Portal belongs. The community is one specially

engaged in missionary work, and they, as well as others, insisted how greatly the spread of the Gospel was impeded by the rivalry and antagonisms which existed in the missionary field; and, in view of the almost universal diffusion and spread of the Anglo-Saxon race, its energy, its initiative, and the position it occupied in China, Africa, America, and Australasia, how much might be done for the cause of Christianity if we could but find some means of reconciling our unhappy divisions.

On Monday I again saw M. Lorin and others, when much was said as to the advantage of personal contact, and the best way in which conferences and discussions might be inaugurated between representative theologians on both sides. In the afternoon I called on M. Lavedan, the editor of the *Correspondant*, who begged the Abbé Portal to write an article on reunion in that review, one of the most important magazines in France. I dined with Mgr. d'Hulst, who expressed himself as being very well pleased with all that had been said and done in regard to reunion, and did not altogether discourage the hope that he might himself take an early opportunity of coming over to England.

In the evening there was a small and informal gathering at Dr. Ferrand's, where, amongst others, were the President of the Cercle Catholique, several members of the Institute of France, M. de Marcieu, and others. I was again asked to repeat some of the things I had said on the Friday afternoon, and to give other information as to what were the position and teaching of the English Church, what had been the origin of the Oxford Movement, and what reason there was to believe that any of those who were entitled to speak with authority on behalf of the Church of England and any considerable number of its members really cared about reunion.

I tried to explain how the first impulse to the Oxford Movement had been given by the determination to resist the aggressions of the State, and more especially by the suppression of some of the Irish bishoprics; how the Movement so inaugurated had gradually affected almost

every department of Church life; had vindicated the Church's freedom against the intrusion of the civil power in spiritual matters; had restored its synods, revived its doctrine, recovered its ritual, given birth to innumerable works of charity, guilds, societies, and organisations of all sorts for the relief of distress, invigorated missionary efforts, erected new sees, at home and abroad, built and restored churches throughout the length and breadth of the country, founded hospitals, inspired vocations to the religious life, creating communities of men and women, which were spreading themselves not only in England, but in India, Africa, and America. I emphasized how great a change all this had produced in the feeling of the country; how it had abated prejudices and dispelled misunderstandings, making the Church of England a real power in the land and preparing the way for that reunion of Christendom, the hope of which, despite the enormous difficulties which stood in the way of its realisation, excited so strange and powerful an influence on all who realised what such reunion would mean for the cause of Christ's religion throughout the world. Some questions were asked, as on the previous occasion—amongst others, what was the practice of the Church of England as to Confession, to which I replied that I believed the only difference between the Roman Church and ourselves on the subject was that, while the Roman Church in certain cases said you *must*, the Church of England said you *ought*.

The gathering ended by my being asked to give a '*conférence*' on reunion to the members of the Catholic Club and their friends some time in the current year, which I promised to do.

On the Tuesday morning I had an interview of some considerable length with the Bishop of Arras, who had expressed a wish to see me, and invited me to pay him a visit at Boulogne, where I should have an opportunity of speaking to his clergy on the subject.

On my return to England I put the foregoing narrative, which had been contained in a letter to the Archbishop of York, into the form of a Memorandum

for private circulation. The Memorandum concluded thus :—

I should like to emphasize again how greatly the attitude and disposition of all whom I saw in Paris encouraged the hope of reunion and the duty of working for it. The *Revue Anglo-Romaine* is being widely and carefully read in the quarters where it will be most useful—it is in the hands of the bishops, and is taken in at all the seminaries. It has a circulation not only in France, but in Germany, Italy and America. It gives information which it is difficult to procure abroad by publishing *in extenso* the text of English formularies and authoritative documents—as, for example, portions of the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles, the Ordination Services, the English Kalendar, Archbishop Parker's Register, extracts from Bishop Forbes's *Considerationes Modestæ*, etc., etc., etc. The articles which have already appeared in it by Father Puller on the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the real object of the Thirty-first Article are exciting some surprise and a wide and general interest. In regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice they are accepted as perfectly satisfactory and orthodox, and when it is remembered that the thesis maintained in them is substantially the same as that asserted by the late Dr. Milligan¹ in his book on our Lord's Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood, and in a very careful article on the same subject which appeared in the *Tablet* about eighteen months ago, it will be seen how great a step in one most important direction has been already taken towards the removal of misconceptions and for harmonising apparent differences of doctrine.

What is really wanted now is something which should exhibit and give expression to as great a desire for union in England as that which is making itself so widely and intelligently felt in France—something which, not dissimulating the difficulties in the way of peace, but insisting on the need of patience and prudence, so as not to run the risk of provoking fresh divisions at home, whilst seeking for reunion abroad, should witness to the deep and wide desire for union which exists amongst members of the Church of England. There is a great need that English authorities should make it clear that we

¹ Rev. William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.

recognise our present position to be abnormal, and contrary to what our Lord intended for His Church, that we are honestly anxious and prepared to approach points of difference from other standpoints than our own. It cannot be our wisdom to play into the hands of those who have no care for reunion, by standing aloof, saying union is impossible, and insisting upon all that makes it difficult. On the contrary, it should be our endeavour to go as far as we can in the opposite direction and to show that we are sincerely anxious to be true to the teaching of the undivided Church and our own Western tradition. We have to make it clear that while, even in the interests of reunion, we are not indifferent to what we believe to be the truth, not careless about throwing away advantages which have been providentially given us for reconciling the claims of reason and faith, nor in such haste as to be willing to run the risk of not carrying the great mass of Church opinion with us, we do earnestly desire peace. We have to show how small all personal sacrifices would seem which would ensure peace, and how more than ready we should be to welcome conferences which might lead to the removal of misunderstandings, and prepare the way for that reunion which all Christians should have at heart. There can be no sort of doubt, after the letter from Cardinal Rampolla published in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* of 1st February, of the sentiments entertained by Leo XIII. on this subject.

‘It is impossible,’ the Cardinal writes, ‘to exaggerate the earnest desire entertained by the Pope to promote the peace and unity of the Christian family. The Pope would grudge no pains, no thought, no labour in such a cause. Nor can there be the slightest doubt as to the cordiality of the welcome which he would give to any proposals for a friendly exchange of ideas which might smooth and prepare the way for so happy a result.’

Who, indeed, can doubt it, after the words of the Pope himself, pronounced so lately as the third of the present month.¹ ‘Anxious to do all in our power to inaugurate still greater schemes for the reunion of those members of the Christian family who, whether in East or West, are unhappily separated from us, our whole heart and soul goes out towards them in a sacred vision of peace. It is Christ the Redeemer Himself, to Whom are known the times and seasons propitious for such attempts, Who urges us forward. The love of Christ constrains

¹ March 1896.

us. It is He, the Good Shepherd, the Prince of the shepherds of His flock, Whose example we so earnestly desire to follow by striving each day with increasing eagerness to promote the accomplishment of the prayer which was the last bequest of His love. Although it may not be granted to us to see the complete realisation of our desires, we have the intimate conviction that at no distant period those desires will be realised, under the guidance of God overruling to that end all human affairs. For us it is no small thing to have been allowed to sow the seed of so blessed a peace. . . . And we pray from the bottom of our heart that it may please our Heavenly Father of His infinite mercy to allow nothing to interfere with the work we have set ourselves to accomplish, or to mar the peaceful development of His own kingdom upon earth.'

Will not the rulers of the English Church be inspired by such words, coming from one so close to the confines of another world, and, by claiming their share in the blessings promised to the peacemakers, allow Leo XIII., before his departure hence, to see some fruit of his earnest prayers and persevering efforts on behalf of the peace of the Church and the welfare of the kingdom of God upon earth ?

In a letter to the Abbé Portal, written after my return, I say :—

Quel honneur, c'est la pensée qui me revient à chaque instant, que Dieu nous permette de faire quelque petite chose pour la réunion de la Chrétienté ; de tout ce qu'on pourrait faire dans ce monde, c'est ce qu'il y a de plus beau. Qu'il me soit permis d'être associé avec vous dans une telle œuvre est le plus grand honneur que Dieu ait pu m'accorder.

The Memorandum elicited various answers. Mr. Gladstone wrote :—

I thank you for the interesting paper you have sent me, and while I am probably less sanguine and less charitable than you, I warmly acknowledge your gallant and Christian exertions.

My own views have, I think, been limited to :

- (1) Avoiding whatever tends to the widening of breaches.
- (2) Promoting as far as I can any practical measure which tends in the right direction : under the first head I hope the Pope will not allow evil counsellors to tempt him at this time of day to condemn English Orders. Under the second, I think

the French clergy who have gallantly followed Courayer deserve our respect and gratitude.

Some years ago I conceived the idea of inducing the Oxford Faculty of Theology to undertake or sanction a plan for printing in series the words of the Henotic writers, or writers on reunion.

I submitted this to Dr. Döllinger, who highly approved of it. I then wrote to Dr. James Mozley, Regius Professor. He was of the same mind, but could not carry his Faculty, as he told me Dr. Bright¹ objected—I have never known the reason! So the poor plan went into the limbo of the unfulfilled and abortive. It may revive.

I feel some apprehension lest the effect of the French declarations, which must be excellent, should rouse the adversaries into action, and thus the last error be worse than the first.

I am overwhelmed with work, Butler² business first and most of all, but I did not like to leave such a communication as yours without notice.

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt. Rev. Charles J. Ellicott) said :—

Your Memorandum³ is of the greatest psychological interest, as it places, with great candour and clearness, before the reader the inner spiritual feelings of the earnest and godly persons who are supporting the Holy Father in his prayers, and in the great work which, he tells us, he has set himself to accomplish.

Having said this I can, alas, say no more; as it has been my especial care to say nothing that might give a chill to the generous enthusiasm that is pervading the movements of those who, like yourself, are striving to give substance to what my whole reason tells me is—to use the kindest of the two epithets of our own Primate—visionary.

What I dread most is this—that by the bitter and unpromising action of the hierarchy of the Roman Church in England a declaration of the non-validity of English Orders will ultimately be extorted, and the triumph of the ‘power that is behind the Pope’ will again be secured.

To myself and to the great silent party of our Mother Church

¹ The Rev. W. Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church. His attitude on the Roman question had always been unsympathetic, and his influence was largely responsible for the position taken up later by the Bishop of Lincoln, both in regard to that and the subject of divorce.

² Mr. Gladstone’s book on Bishop Butler.

³ The account of my visit to Paris.

of England this will be no more than another confirmation of the stern teaching of history, but I dread it for the ultimate effect it may have on many of the generous spirits in our own Church who are now working with widely different hopes and expectations.

However, I will say no more, but from my heart commend you to God's holy keeping.

The Bishop of Rochester¹ thanked me for reckoning him among those who would be interested in the Memorandum.

It is indeed deeply interesting, he said, a great deal of it is more than I should have supposed possible, and it shows the existence of forces of opinion and sympathy for which one must be very thankful. You would indeed be wrong if you did not follow up such openings with all your heart.

Sir Thomas Dick Lauder wrote from Florence :—

I am profoundly interested by the Memorandum. It really looks as if the many prayers and devotional acts which are now ascending to plead for reunion have had their effect, and that our Blessed Lord saw that His faithful people were at last worthy to be blessed by the fulfilment of His own last prayer for the peace and unity of His Church. One's pulses quicken at the thought that even *we* may be allowed to see some great step taken towards this blessed end. I have had a letter from the Superior of the Sacro Speco.² He says, speaking of 'l'union, à laquelle je consacre moi-même, chaque jour, et mes humbles prières et mes modestes travaux. . . . j'aime à penser qu'un jour nous aurons le bonheur de nous asseoir au même banquet divin, et de voir nos intelligences dans une même conformité de vue, comme déjà nos cœurs sont dans une entière et parfaite unité de sympathie et de sentiments.'

The Rev. W. B. Hankey, of St. Mary's, Graham Street, in reply to the Memorandum, enclosed the following paper in order 'to see what would be thought of a possible line of explanation':—

(1) The ultimate basis of certainty on matters of Faith and Morals is the infallibility which resides in the collective Episcopate of the Catholic Church as, *jure divino*, its teaching Organ.

¹ The Rt. Rev. Edward Stuart Talbot.

² The Benedictine monastery at Subiaco.

(2) The element essential to infallibility in any Definition of Faith, however promulgated, whether by a General Council or by the Pope, is its agreement with the teaching of the collective Episcopate.

(3) Granted that the Pope takes proper steps to ensure that his Definition shall be in agreement with the teaching of the collective Episcopate, it will be obviously just as accurate an expression of the Mind of the Universal Church as the Definition of a General Council.

(4) The authority to ascertain and promulgate the teaching of the collective Episcopate belongs to the Pope as their Head, by virtue of his succession to the Primacy conferred by our Lord upon St. Peter, and, in exercising the authority, he has the special assistance of the Holy Ghost.

(5) An '*ex Cathedra*' definition of the Pope is known by the fact that it is accepted as such by the morally unanimous assent of the collective Episcopate. Were the collective Episcopate to repudiate the Pope's Definition, it would prove that he had spoken not 'as the Pastor or Teacher of all Christians,' but as a private individual, because he had separated himself from the Body.

(6) When the Vatican Council asserts that Papal definitions *ex cathedra* are 'irreformable' in themselves, 'and not from the consent of the Church,' this may be understood to mean that when the Pope's Definition is accepted by the collective Episcopate as '*ex Cathedra*' *no further consent of the Church is necessary*. The main subject of the clause being to prevent its rejection by certain churches or by private individuals on the plea that the question has not been decided by a *Council*, and is, therefore, still an open one.

(7) There are not *two* infallible authorities in the Church, one the Pope, and the other the collective Episcopate; but the Pope is, in certain cases, the organ by which the Mind of the Universal Church finds its outward expression.

Thus explained, there would be nothing in the Vatican Decrees contrary to Möhler's dictum: 'In no individual, considered as such, can infallibility reside,' for the Papal Definition is really the authoritative expression of the Collective Wisdom of the whole Body, guided by the perpetual indwelling of the Holy Ghost 'into all truth.'

CHAPTER XI

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE INTO THE VALIDITY
OF ENGLISH ORDERS—THE ABBÉ PORTAL'S VISIT TO LONDON—
LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK TO THE ABBÉ PORTAL—
THE REV. T. A. LACEY AND FATHER FULLER'S ARRIVAL IN
ROME—CORRESPONDENCE UP TO APRIL 24TH.

IN the beginning of March 1896, Mgr. Gasparri was summoned to Rome by the Pope to take part in the investigation into the validity of English Orders.

On arriving there, he found that the question had been referred to a commission, of which Canon Moyes, Dom Gasquet, and Father David, a Franciscan, who had been sent to Rome by Cardinal Vaughan, with a long case on the subject, presumably adverse, were members. The Pope had himself put on the Commission the Abbé Duchesne and Mgr. Gasparri, whose opinions were known to be favourable to the English Church; and he subsequently added the Padre de Augustinis, a Jesuit professor at the Roman College, who had already addressed a private memorandum to the Pope in favour of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church, and Father Scannell, whose letters, in the *Tablet*, on the subject of 'intention' and of the effect of the Bull of Pope Paul IV., had attracted some attention. The attitude of Father Scannell on these points had been friendly to the Church of England, so that the personal action of the Pope was one for which all who felt how great a step in the direction of peace would be taken, if justice were done to the Church of England in this matter, had every reason to be thankful. Mgr. Gasparri, however, was a theologian rather than a historian, and the Abbé Duchesne was more conversant with the history of the first eight centuries than with that of the sixteenth. It was obvious,

therefore, how important it was that they should be supplied with full information as to the facts of the case ; and this was made the more evident by a request from Mgr. Gasparri to be allowed to communicate with Mr. Lacey, one of the authors of the *Hierarchia Anglicana*, by telegraph, as to any points of special historical knowledge he might require in the course of the inquiry. He asked certain questions in the letter containing this request, which showed how necessary it was that some one well acquainted with the facts should be on the spot to give such information as might be required ; and the Abbé Portal did not hesitate in consequence to come over to England to see if this could be arranged. He arrived on the 25th March, and, owing to his representations, it was arranged that Father Puller, S.S.J.E., from Cowley, and Mr. Lacey should go to Rome on Easter Tuesday, the Abbé Portal going himself to Rome on the Monday in Holy Week to arrange for their arrival. The following letters give the details of these proceedings. Easter Sunday this year fell on 5th April.

In a letter to the Abbé Portal early in March, after telling him that I had been anxious to do all that I could to allay the irritation of Cardinal Vaughan and his surroundings, I go on to say that for this purpose :

J'ai cru qu'il serait bon de parler au cardinal de l'impression que ma visite à Paris m'avait faite, c'est-à-dire de lui faire comprendre à quel point je trouvais tout le monde en France intéressé à la question de l'union, et de lui dire que j'avais vu le duc de Broglie, M. de Richemont, Mgr. d'Hulst, l'abbé Boudinhon, etc., etc., enfin de lui demander d'user de ses bons offices avec le père Bridgett, ce Rédemptoriste dont je vous ai parlé, pour qu'il écrive dans la *Revue* sur la vie de Sir Thomas More le petit article que nous désirons.¹

La situation qu'au fond nous connaissions déjà s'est éclaircie tout de suite, le cardinal n'aime pas la *Revue* du tout ; évidem-

¹ It was objected against the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* later on that it was too much in the hands of Anglicans (see letter from the Abbé Portal, 17th July 1896, p. 340). If this was the case, it was due to Cardinal Vaughan, who objected to English Roman Catholics writing in it (see letter to the Abbé Portal, 1st May 1896, p. 298).

ment il la déteste. Je lui ai parlé de conférences entre théologiens romains et anglicans préalables à toute décision sur la question des Ordres. Il m'a demandé quelles seraient les personnes que j'indiquerais pour une telle conférence. 'Voudrait-on aller à Rome ? Irais-je moi-même ? Evidemment le Pape ne pourrait ou ne voudrait pas inviter un évêque protestant, etc., etc.' On voyait bien qu'il souhaitait une décision contraire, et avant peu. L'irritation évidente que produit la *Revue* nous donne la preuve qu'on sent la position attaquée et pas trop solide.

Nous avons dit un mot sur la question des conversions, c'est la question qui revient sans cesse. Je lui ai dit qu'il se trompait s'il croyait que l'action de ceux qui écrivaient dans la *Revue* et l'attitude bienveillante de certains membres du clergé français empêchaient les conversions individuelles. 'Ah,' m'a-t-il dit, 'j'ai vu ce matin une dame qui s'est convertie. Elle me dit qu'elle était fille d'un clergyman, qu'elle avait toujours cru à la validité des Ordres anglicans, mais que la *Revue* lui avait suggéré les premiers doutes.' Puis il a ajouté qu'il lisait peu la *Revue*, seulement qu'il y avait vu de fort mauvais articles d'un certain Puller, etc., etc. Et alors il m'a demandé si j'avais lu dans la *Revue* un article d'un cardinal dont il a donné le nom, le cardinal Segna, qui répondait bien à Mgr. Gasparri sur la question des ordinations anglicanes.

Comment savait-il le nom de ce cardinal ? Ici on a cru que cet article était écrit par le chanoine Moyes. Le cardinal m'a dit que le chanoine Moyes partait pour Rome avec Dom Gasquet la semaine prochaine,¹ et qu'on allait tout de suite s'occuper de la question des ordinations anglicanes. Je crois qu'il a dit aussi qu'on lui avait demandé à Rome un rapport sur ce sujet, et j'ai cru comprendre que c'était justement ce rapport que le chanoine Moyes devait porter à Rome. Le cardinal m'a aussi fait comprendre que l'abbé Duchesne devait faire partie de la commission. J'ai déjeuné avec lui. Il était très aimable et il m'a prié de revenir, mais ils sont tous acharnés contre nous. Pour cela, il n'y a pas le plus petit doute.

Vous devriez voir Mgr. Gasparri et le bien exciter à poursuivre le chanoine Moyes et Dom Gasquet jusque dans leurs derniers retranchements. Mgr. Merry del Val est une influence tout à fait hostile à notre action.

¹ Dom Gasquet, Canon Moyes, and Father David Fleming, a Franciscan, arrived in Rome 19th March (see Gasquet's *Diary*), taking with them an *expositio* on Anglican Orders, and a copy of Crammer's works !

Writing again, on the 13th March, I say :—

Evidemment il est impossible qu'on néglige à Rome ce que dira le chanoine Moyes appuyé, comme il le sera, par le cardinal, par Mgr. Merry del Val, etc., mais je crois qu'on serait assez content d'éviter toute décision. Une décision *contre*, est très difficile pour beaucoup de raisons théologiques et autres. Une décision *pour*, à ce moment, est aussi très difficile. Dans les circonstances actuelles, une décision qui serait entre les deux et impliquerait une réordination *sub conditione*, agacerait les catholiques anglais presque autant qu'une décision *pour*, et, comme vous vous en êtes déjà aperçu d'après la lettre ¹ du Père Puller, se prêterait très facilement à une foule de malentendus de notre côté.

Pour qu'on la prit bien ici il faudrait beaucoup d'explications semblables à celles que j'ai indiquées dans le mémoire ² que je vous envoie, mais tout cela demanderait du temps.

Maintenant, plus les catholiques anglais se seraient mis en quatre pour obtenir une condamnation à Rome, plus le *silence de Rome* et l'absence de toute condamnation seraient significatifs. Ils auraient au fond échoué complètement, et cela serait évident en ce moment, et aurait encore plus d'importance à l'avenir. Le silence dans de telles circonstances serait, il me semble, tout à fait dans les habitudes de Rome, et d'accord avec ses traditions et ses manières d'agir. On se tairait sur la question des Ordres, et le cardinal Rampolla ferait savoir d'une manière plus ou moins formelle qu'on est content à Rome de toutes les informations qu'on a reçues sur une question très épineuse, et sur laquelle il est évident qu'il y a beaucoup à apprendre, mais que, comme la question des Ordres n'est pas la seule, et qu'il y en a d'autres tout aussi nécessaires à discuter, l'avis du cardinal serait d'entreprendre la discussion d'une autre, par exemple celle du sacrifice de la messe, et d'étudier dans les intérêts de la réunion, quel est le véritable enseignement de l'Eglise anglicane sur ce sujet, et ainsi de suite avec d'autres.³

¹ In which he had remarked that it was much easier for Rome to take the opportunity of freeing the question of Orders from the consequences of scholastic teaching in regard to 'the porrection of the instruments' than, say, for the Archbishop of Canterbury to acquiesce in any ceremony of reordination *sub conditione*.

² The account of what had occurred at Paris.

³ A discussion on English Ordinations, even if there had been no decision upon them, if it had led to conferences on other subjects, would have secured the object the Abbé Portal and I had desired from the first.

Je suis sûr que pour la doctrine du sacrifice on pourrait arriver à un accord complet.

Cette manière d'agir serait celle que nous nous sommes toujours proposée. Eh bien ! mon cher ami, voilà une idée que je laisse à votre considération. Elle m'a traversé la tête ce matin, et je vous la donne pour ce qu'elle vaut.

Replying a day or two later, the Abbé Portal says :—

Il est clair qu'on s'acharne à démontrer que le parti de l'union chez vous n'a pas de consistance. Cette tactique commande la vôtre. La lettre ¹ de l'archevêque d'York, dont il a été question entre nous, serait excellente. Autour de cette lettre, il serait bien, ce me semble, d'organiser une démonstration d'un certain nombre de prêtres et de laïques, une lettre au Saint Père, signée par le plus de monde possible. Enfin, examinez s'il ne serait pas encore possible de s'introduire, pour ainsi dire de force, dans la discussion des Ordres. Voici une idée qui n'est pas aussi extravagante qu'elle le paraît au premier abord. Si Lacey et le père Puller écrivaient au Pape spontanément une lettre, que j'irais moi-même porter à Rome, et qui ne serait publiée qu'après la décision de Léon XIII., par laquelle ils exprimeraient leurs dispositions d'aller à Rome donner des explications sur la validité de leurs Ordres, je suis sûr que nous aurions partie gagnée. Cette lettre pourrait se motiver : (1) Sur le désir d'union, (2) Sur la lettre ² que le cardinal Rampolla m'a adressée. Il y aurait dans cette démarche une crânerie qui vous vaudrait chez nous toutes les sympathies. Encore une fois, croyez que cette démarche n'est pas aussi extravagante qu'elle en a l'air ; elle serait, il me semble, assurée du succès, et, en tous cas, vous prenez toujours le beau rôle. Deux volontaires, non pas deux envoyés, mais agissant avec la permission de leurs supérieurs, créeraient par leur démarche une situation nouvelle. Cette démarche sera rendue plus facile par l'agitation qui va se produire.

Je crois, comme vous, que le meilleur serait de n'avoir pas de solution du tout au sujet de vos Ordres. Plus on y pense, plus on voit que dès le commencement nous avons pris la bonne position. La question des Ordres n'est qu'un moyen pour avoir des conférences sur tous les points discutés. Le Pape

¹ A letter from the Archbishop of York such as he wrote later on. See letter of Archbishop York of 27th March to the Abbé Portal, p. 280.

² See letter from the Abbé Portal, enclosing extracts from a letter of Cardinal Rampolla, of 19th September 1894.

et le cardinal Rampolla s'y prêteront, pour sûr. Il me semble que de votre côté, il doit y avoir moyen, sans rien compromettre, de provoquer ces conférences.

L'an passé, par votre mémoire¹ et par les lettres de vos évêques, vous avez gagné la partie. Il faudrait agir de la même manière.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

Mars 20, 1896.

Je reviens de Brighton,² je pars pour Canterbury. Je vous écrirai demain. L'archevêque d'York promet d'écrire la lettre que nous désirons. Il est très content de ce qu'a écrit le père Puller. J'ai vu le père Puller, il ira à Rome si l'archevêque d'York croit qu'il doit y aller, mais impossibilité absolue qu'il y aille avant Pâques.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

21 mars 1896.

Envoyez-moi une esquisse de la lettre que le père Puller devrait écrire au Saint Père. J'ai écrit très longuement à l'archevêque d'York.

Je crois que si vraiment il était nécessaire que Puller et Lacey allassent à Rome, l'archevêque d'York leur conseillerait ce voyage.

L'archevêque doit être à Londres mercredi prochain pour deux jours. Maintenant si vous croyez qu'il faut le voir à tout prix, ainsi que Puller et Lacey, venez ici chez moi mardi pour deux ou trois jours. Je ne pense pas que vous deviez rester plus longtemps à cause des vôtres, qui sont d'une humeur!! J'ai pris la résolution d'écrire au Cardinal Rampolla. Nous avons eu hier une réunion magnifique à Canterbury³ où j'ai parlé de la réunion.

Je dois voir l'archevêque de Canterbury demain.

The letter to Cardinal Rampolla alluded to in the preceding letter of 21st March, was as follows :—

¹ Memorandum and letters presented to the Pope.

² A meeting at Brighton on 19th March, where I had spoken on reunion.

³ Meeting at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 20th March.

*Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla**Le 20 mars 1896.*

Je crois savoir que l'abbé Portal vous a fait part de ce qui s'est passé à Paris à l'époque de ma visite il y a dix jours.

J'ai pu, depuis mon retour, en parler aux archevêques de Canterbury et d'York, aussi bien qu'à plusieurs de nos évêques, et l'effet en a été excellent. L'archevêque d'York me dit dans une lettre que je reçois de lui ce matin : ' Il y a grande cause de reconnaissance pour tout ce qui se passe à Rome aussi bien qu'à Paris, mais en même temps je crains que nous n'estimions pas assez les forces de ceux qui voudraient obtenir la condamnation de nos Ordres. Si cela se fait, ça mettrait fin à tout espoir d'union.'

M. Gladstone me dit aussi : ' J'espère ardemment qu'au point où nous en sommes le Saint Père se gardera bien de se laisser mener, par de mauvais conseils, à une condamnation des Ordres anglicans.'

Et l'évêque de Gloucester exprime les mêmes sentiments, disant : ' Ce que je crains le plus, pour l'effet que cela produirait sur les esprits ici, serait que l'influence de la hiérarchie romaine en Angleterre si peu favorable à la paix et si hostile à tout projet d'union, obtint une déclaration niant la validité de nos Ordres.'

J'ose, monsieur le cardinal, vous mettre au fait de ces sentiments qui, je puis vous l'affirmer avec la plus grande certitude, n'expriment que la vérité absolue. J'espère qu'une lettre importante de l'archevêque d'York paraîtra sous peu, et j'espère aussi qu'une communication se rapportant au sujet de conférences dont parle la lettre de votre Eminence dernièrement publiée sera faite au Saint Père de la part des auteurs de la *Hierarchia Anglicana* et d'autres encore.

Je dois voir l'archevêque d'York à ce sujet la semaine prochaine.

En somme, je crois pouvoir assurer votre Eminence que si rien n'arrive qui détruise tout ce qui se fait ici pour la réunion, l'état des esprits ici s'améliore visiblement, et je ne me suis jamais trouvé avec tant d'espoir qu'à ce moment. Evidemment cela sera long, mais qu'on marche c'est déjà beaucoup.

On ne peut lire sans émotion les paroles touchantes du Saint Père prononcées au commencement de ce mois.

Votre Eminence me demandera peut-être ce qui a provoqué ma lettre. C'est qu'on annonce ici de la part des personnes

qui devraient être les mieux renseignées, que la condamnation des Ordres anglicans doit être prononcée prochainement à Rome. C'est peut-être l'expression d'un désir plutôt que d'un fait. Je prie Dieu qu'il en soit ainsi.

J'ose, Eminence, vous prier de me mettre aux pieds de Sa Sainteté. Le souvenir de sa bonté demeure toujours dans mon cœur.

H. E. Cardinal Rampolla to Lord Halifax

ROME, mars 1896.

La lettre confidentielle que vous m'avez adressée le 20 de ce mois m'a renouvelé le plaisir que j'ai eu lorsqu'il y a un an, j'ai fait votre connaissance personnelle. Je m'empresse donc d'y répondre, soit pour vous assurer de l'intérêt avec lequel j'ai lu tout ce que vous m'avez communiqué, soit parce que je tiens à vous persuader que la question dont vous parlez n'est étudiée par le Saint Siège qu'avec la plus grande impartialité, et sans avoir arrêté d'avance quel en sera le résultat. Par conséquent rien ne saurait justifier aucune préoccupation, d'autant plus que le Saint Siège ne va prendre aucune décision immédiate ; au contraire, il est disposé à soumettre à son attention toutes les raisons que l'on porte de part et d'autre au sujet de la dite question.

Sa Sainteté a beaucoup agréé l'hommage des sentiments que vous avez voulu lui renouveler par mon entremise ; c'est en son nom que j'ai le plaisir de vous en remercier, tandis que j'aime à vous offrir les assurances nouvelles de mes sentiments distingués.

In view of what was being said and done at Rome and elsewhere to secure a condemnation of the English Ordinal, and to put a stop to what was being attempted in the interests of reunion, the Abbé Portal thought it desirable to come to London to concert such measures as might be possible in an opposite direction. The letters of the Archbishop of York to the Abbé Portal and to Father Puller, together with the journey of Father Puller and Mr. Lacey to Rome, were the result.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

22 mars 1896.

Je partirai mardi matin à 9 heures et arriverai à Londres vers 5 heures. Il ne faut pas trop vous tourmenter au sujet de

Rome. L'appel de Mgr. Gasparri est une garantie en votre faveur, mais il est nécessaire de contrebalancer l'influence des catholiques anglais. Le père Ragey et autres se servent contre nous d'une lettre de l'archevêque d'York qui contiendrait la phrase suivante : ' Nous devenons de plus en plus catholiques, mais de moins en moins romains.'¹ Ils en parlent en grand mystère, mais ils en parlent pour démontrer que personne chez vous ne veut de l'union.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

23 mars 1896.

Voici une lettre de Mgr. Gasparri. Je vais lui répondre et le mettre au courant de nos mouvements.

Il résulte de cette lettre que l'action personnelle du Pape est toute en notre faveur. C'est là qu'il faut agir.

Enclosure from Mgr. Gasparri to the Abbé Portal

ROME.

Je ne puis vous donner des renseignements bien complets ; mais d'après ce que je sais, l'affaire sera chaude. Outre la Commission Cardinalice² et les trois Anglais envoyés par le Cardinal Vaughan, le Pape a voulu que trois autres prennent part à la discussion, l'abbé Duchesne, moi, et un autre, que je ne connais pas encore. Je ne sais pas quand les séances commencent.

[Certain historical questions unnecessary to reproduce.]

Veuillez me dire si je puis demander à M. Lacey et au père Puller, des renseignements historiques par dépêche, car la dépense serait pour moi trop considérable. M. Duchesne m'a dit qu'il se réservait la partie historique, me laissant l'intention et le rite.

¹ How little justification there was for the use made of this phrase, and how it misrepresented the Archbishop's real attitude, will be seen by comparing it with the letter of the Archbishop of York to the Abbé Portal of the 27th of March, p. 280.

² This refers to the first commission presided over by Cardinal Mazzella, of which Dom Gasquet, Canon Moyes and Father David, etc., were members. The commission of Cardinals, to which the matter was finally referred, was another and distinct body.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

23 mars 1896.

Vous aurez reçu ma dépêche. Arrivez, si cela vous convient, mercredi soir.

J'ai prié Puller et Lacey de venir dîner avec nous ce soir. Je dois voir l'archevêque d'York demain à 6 heures, mais seulement pour un instant. Il n'arrive que demain de la campagne. Mercredi et jeudi il est tout à fait occupé, mais il me donne une heure vendredi soir.

De cette façon nous verrons ce qu'il y a à faire avec le père Puller et Lacey mercredi, et s'il est nécessaire vous pourrez voir l'archevêque vendredi.

Si c'était nécessaire j'irais à Rome, mais je ne vois pas à quoi ma présence servirait.

La vraie utilité de Puller et de Lacey à Rome ne serait-elle pas de donner des renseignements à Mgr. Gasparri sur des questions inattendues ?

I saw the Archbishop of York at the Athenæum on Tuesday, the 24th, and discussed with him the question of Father Puller and Mr. Lacey going to Rome. The Abbé Portal arrived on the 25th, and Father Puller, Mr. Lacey, Mr. Birkbeck, Mr. George Murray, and the Warden of Keble (the Rev. Robert Wilson, D.D.,) met him at dinner. On the 26th Mr. Wilfrid Ward and Mrs. Ward met the Abbé at luncheon. I brought the Archbishop of York back from the House of Lords later, and he had much talk before dinner with the Abbé, Father Puller, Mr. Birkbeck, and Mr. Athelstan Riley. In consequence the Archbishop agreed to write a letter to the Abbé Portal which the latter might show to Cardinal Rampolla and to the Pope. Mr. and Mrs. Wilfrid Ward dined again to meet the Abbé, and the next day he returned to Paris.

The Archbishop of York to the Abbé Portal

27 mars 1896.

Depuis longtemps je désire vous exprimer par écrit comme je l'ai déjà fait de vive voix l'admiration que j'éprouve pour vos

efforts généreux en faveur de la réunion de la chrétienté et mon sentiment de la vive reconnaissance qui vous est due à ce sujet.

La publication de la *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, dont vous êtes le fondateur, me fournit une occasion favorable de vous rendre ce témoignage, et je vous le rends de tout mon cœur. Je lis la *Revue* avec un profond intérêt, et j'ai un vif espoir qu'elle produira beaucoup de bien en aidant à dissiper les malentendus réciproques de ceux qui, bien que séparés extérieurement, sont unis dans la même foi de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ.

De la part de la communion anglicane je puis dire avec assurance que notre désir suprême est de maintenir la foi confiée aux saints—'quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus' et de conserver la vérité dans l'unité de l'esprit et dans les liens de la charité.

Au sujet de nos relations avec l'Eglise de Rome : d'une part il est absolument inutile de s'attendre à ce que l'Angleterre accepte jamais l'idée de la Papauté telle qu'on nous l'a habituellement présentée ici. Mais d'un autre côté il nous serait impossible d'hésiter à admettre tout ce qu'on pourrait démontrer être en accord avec la volonté de Notre Seigneur et l'enseignement de l'Eglise primitive.

C'est dans ce sentiment que nous saisissons avec plaisir toute occasion favorable de 'conférences amicales,' dont le but serait de nous faire mieux connaître les uns aux autres, en nous plaçant sur le principe de St. Augustin : 'in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.' Je puis vous assurer que les paroles récentes de Léon XIII. au sujet de l'union ont été vivement appréciées en Angleterre. Elles attestent son grand cœur et l'amour avec lequel il désire l'unité de la grande famille chrétienne. Nous apprenons que la question des Ordres anglicans est discutée à Rome en ce moment, et que parmi ceux qui sont nommés pour prendre part à la discussion se trouvent l'abbé Duchesne et Mgr. Gasparri. Le choix de tels hommes dont les opinions sont bien connues, prouve heureusement le désir du Pape de voir ce sujet traité de la manière la plus complète et la plus favorable. Quant au résultat de cette enquête, comme vous le savez bien, à nos yeux la validité de nos Ordres n'a pas besoin d'être confirmée, car pour nous elle est absolument certaine—de plus, leur condamnation n'affaiblirait nullement notre confiance en notre position. Mais, par rapport à la cause de la réunion, une condamnation aurait les conséquences les plus

désastreuses—ce serait un coup mortel pour toutes les chères espérances qui ont été exprimées avec tant de ferveur et d'amour par le Pape, et qui ont trouvé un écho fidèle dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre.

Nous devons prier ardemment pour que le Pape ne soit pas amené à sanctionner une décision qui anéantirait toutes les espérances et tous les désirs si chers à son cœur.

On connaît bien les obstacles qu'il trouve dans la route qu'il veut suivre, et l'opposition qu'il doit rencontrer.

Aussi j'apprends avec plaisir que deux prêtres de l'Eglise anglicane, bien à même de fournir des renseignements utiles sur les faits se rattachant à la question, se trouveront à Rome durant l'enquête.

Soyez assuré, Monsieur l'abbé, de mes prières continuelles; que Dieu bénisse vos travaux et votre zèle pour cette sainte cause.

At the same time the Archbishop of York wrote a letter to be prefixed as a preface to the articles by Father Puller on the English Ordinal, which had already appeared in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, and which were about to be republished in the form of a pamphlet. The letter was written in English, but the following translation was submitted to, and approved by, the Archbishop :—

J'ai lu avec un intérêt profond les articles que vous avez donnés à la *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. Le sujet des Ordres de l'Eglise d'Angleterre s'est attiré tout récemment chez nous comme à l'étranger une attention spéciale; et il était important qu'il fût traité avec les savantes recherches que vous y avez apportées.

Vous montrez très clairement, en tant que vous traitez la question, qu'il n'y a absolument rien qui fasse défaut à la validité complète de nos ordinations.

Je remarque que des théologiens et historiens éminents de l'Eglise romaine dans des travaux récents ont exprimé des opinions plus en accord avec les nôtres sur ce sujet que les écrivains romains ne l'ont fait d'habitude jusqu'ici. Quelques-uns se sont déclarés convaincus de la validité de nos ordinations. D'autres bien qu'admettant qu'on ne peut plus soutenir plusieurs des anciennes objections, s'appuient encore sur deux défauts supposés. C'est-à-dire, l'omission de la 'porrectio instrumen-

torum,' et, l'absence qu'on allègue d'une vraie intention, le résultat du manque de croyance, qu'on nous prête au sacrifice eucharistique. Il est impossible de regarder ces deux points comme d'une importance sérieuse.

Le premier était une cérémonie inconnue à l'Eglise primitive, aussi bien qu'aux premiers siècles durant lesquels on ne peut supposer que la validité des ordinations était douteuse.

Quant au second : même si l'on pouvait imaginer que l'évêque officiant n'eût pas une vraie croyance dans le sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, tel manque de croyance n'empêcherait en rien une intention sérieuse de conférer les Ordres sacrés, et ne peut être supposé capable de rendre l'acte de l'Ordination invalide.

Les doctrines exagérées au sujet de l'intention, avancées aujourd'hui par quelques théologiens de l'Eglise romaine, surtout en Angleterre, constituent un développement comparativement moderne, et sont rejetées par beaucoup de théologiens les plus savants de cette Eglise.¹

De plus, et ces points à part, vous avez démontré de la façon la plus claire qu'on ne peut accuser de fait les Réformateurs de l'Eglise anglicane au seizième siècle de ce manque d'intention en ce qui concerne le caractère sacrificiant du sacerdoce. Vous avez démontré aussi que cette intention a toujours été reconnue jusqu'au temps présent. En effet elle est distinctement affirmée dans la Préface de l'Ordinal. Il est également certain que l'Article xxxi. de l'Eglise anglicane ne nie pas cette vérité, elle en nie seulement l'application spéciale qui à cette époque était très répandue en Angleterre, et dans d'autres parties de l'Eglise de l'Occident.

Je vous suis très reconnaissant des services importants que par le moyen de ces articles d'une si grande valeur vous avez rendu à l'Eglise d'Angleterre, comme à la cause de la vérité elle-même.

¹ See Tournely (*De Sacr.*, qu. vi. a. 1), quoted in *A Catholic Dictionary*, Addis and Arnold, p. 811 (ed. 1909):—

'Whatever a man's opinions may be about the Sacrament, its effect and end, or about the Church itself, whether he rejects all these things or admits them, makes no difference to the substance of the Sacrament.' 'He need not intend to produce the effect of the Sacrament, or to perform the rite of the Church as a Sacrament, or to do what the Catholic and Roman Church does; it is enough that he should intend in some general way to do what the Church does, whatever his notion about the Church, the Sacrament, its effect and object may be.'

The Abbé Portal¹ to Lord Halifax

ROME, VIA ST. NICOLA DE TOLENTINO 67,
mercredi, 31 mars 1896.

J'ai vu ce matin MM. Gasparri et Duchesne. Le troisième membre nommé par le Pape est de Augustinis, jésuite, professeur au Collège romain, qui a écrit un mémoire privé concluant à la validité de vos Ordres. Léon XIII. mérite vraiment bien tout ce que les vôtres font pour la paix. Les catholiques anglais ont présenté un énorme mémoire. Duchesne et Gasparri ont été ravis d'apprendre l'arrivée de Lacey et Puller. Ils ont été très intéressés sur la campagne que nous allons mener parallèlement à leurs travaux. Ni l'un ni l'autre ne sait si les résultats de la commission seront remis au Saint Office ou au Pape personnellement. On croit que Léon XIII. attend ces résultats pour finir son encyclique.

Une condamnation n'est nullement à redouter. Je vous dis cela uniquement pour vous. C'est l'avis de Duchesne et de Gasparri. La Commission n'a eu qu'une séance qui n'a été qu'une occasion pour ces messieurs de faire connaissance. La prochaine doit avoir lieu le mardi de Pâques.

In a letter a day or two later, the Abbé Portal says :—

Dom Gasquet cite avec emphase la lettre de l'archevêque d'York au père Ragey. Le cardinal Vaughan a dit au Collège de St. Joseph de Mill Hill : ' Les amis des anglicans sont très forts à Rome ' ; et comme on lui faisait observer que les jésuites étaient pour lui, il a répondu : ' Les jésuites sont divisés et le père de Augustinis conclut à la validité des Ordres anglicans. '

Le Baron von Hügel m'a raconté que le Pape lui avait dit des choses fort aimables pour vous, mais il a ajouté : ' Ce bon Lord Halifax a tout de même des idées fausses sur l'Eglise. L'Eglise est une et même unique. Dans ma prochaine encyclique je le montrerai. ' Si vous pouviez prononcer dans un discours quelques mots à ce sujet ce serait très bien.

N'oubliez pas de demander quelque chose à M. Gladstone sur le rôle pacificateur de Léon XIII. et un article pour la *Revue*. Envoyez-moi la lettre du cardinal Wiseman à Lord Shrewsbury.² Je voudrais la faire passer dans la *Revue* en entier.

¹ He had gone to Rome immediately after his return to Paris from London.

² *Letter on Catholic Unity* to the Earl of Shrewsbury, by Cardinal Wiseman, then Bishop of Melipotamus, later Archbishop of Westminster, published in 1841. A French translation appeared in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. ii. pp. 193-214.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

6 avril 1896.

Votre lettre de vendredi m'arrive ; je vais m'en occuper tout de suite. La lettre du cardinal Wiseman à Lord Shrewsbury est très difficile à trouver, mais je vais faire de mon mieux. Je n'oublie pas M. Gladstone, à qui j'écirai aujourd'hui. Je suis en train de faire un assez long article pour une de nos principales revues sur la réunion. L'article doit paraître le premier mai et je prendrai soin d'y mettre quelque chose dans le sens que vous m'indiquez.

Comment faire comprendre à Rome que je ne crois qu'à une Eglise, et que tout mon but est de travailler pour le retour de l'Eglise d'Angleterre dans le giron de l'unité catholique et de renouer les relations qui doivent exister entre l'Episcopat anglais et le successeur de S. Pierre.

Si je ne croyais pas à nos Ordres et à nos Sacrements et si je ne croyais pas que notre position de séparation de fait, peut, vu toutes les circonstances du passé et du présent, se justifier, je ne pourrais pas faire ce que je fais : mais de l'autre côté, parce que je suis convaincu de ces choses ce n'est pas à dire que j'ai des idées fausses sur ce que l'Eglise est en elle-même. Vous, mon cher ami, vous connaissez très bien mes idées là-dessus.

C'est détestable de tant parler de soi, mais si le Saint Père se rendait mieux compte de ma position il saurait mieux comment s'y prendre pour ramener l'église anglicane à l'unité. Je puis servir comme type de beaucoup d'autres. Le cardinal Vaughan n'y comprend rien du tout, et si on s'en rapporte lui, on ne fera rien.

Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, was at Rome at this time, and early in April the *Chronicle* announced that the object of the Commission was entirely a domestic one, *i.e.*, how Anglican clergy submitting to the Church were to be treated.

On the 8th April I wrote again to the Abbé :—

Voici ce qu'annonce ce matin le *Daily Chronicle*. Vous le voyez bien, c'est une information qui vient droit de Dom Gasquet.¹

¹ In the spring of 1895 when I met Dom Gasquet in Rome, who was then engaged on the Orders question, and still uncertain whether conferences on that and other questions between representative theologians on both sides could be prevented, he said, either to the Abbé Portal or myself, 'We will take part in such conferences if we are obliged, but in our opinion the question of Orders is a purely domestic one and only concerns us Catholics.' Cf. Dom Gasquet's *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 47.

Remarquez, je vous prie, la couleur qu'on donne à la commission, et comme on prétend qu'il est tout simplement question des conditions à imposer à tous ceux qui, d'après le correspondant, sont disposés à prier le Saint Père de bien vouloir les recevoir dans le giron de l'Eglise catholique.

Remarquez aussi la suite des épithètes contradictoires qu'on applique au Pape, et la mauvaise volonté qu'on y a mise pour dire juste ce qui ferait du mal ici.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward, about the same time, asked me to tell the Abbé Portal that he had written to Cardinal Vaughan about giving the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* his essay on Cardinal Wiseman, but he had had no answer, that he hoped to see the Cardinal the next week, and would write to the Abbé as to the result. He added that he had heard on good authority that the Cardinals in Rome wanted the Orders question to be left in *statu quo*.

Father Puller and Mr. Lacey arrived in Rome on the 9th April. Writing that day, Father Puller says :—

This morning we have had nearly three hours of hard work with Gasparri. It is a great thing that the Jesuit de Augustinis, who is the leading Jesuit theologian in Rome, has been put on the Commission. He had committed himself to the validity of our Orders in a private memorandum addressed to the Pope. Scannell is also here, having been put on the Commission, together with a Spanish theologian, who takes the adverse view.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

10 avril 1896.

Le père Puller et Lacey sont arrivés hier. La matinée a été employée à nous voir et à leur faire connaître notre maison et mes confrères. L'après-midi, nous sommes allés ensemble prier sur le tombeau des Apôtres et rendre visite à l'abbé Duchesne et à Mgr. Gasparri, tous les deux ont été charmants. L'abbé Duchesne a beaucoup causé, surtout avec le père Puller. Mgr. Gasparri a de suite demandé un renseignement sur Farrar, le successeur de Barlow, que ces trois messieurs de la commission étaient incapables d'avoir. La nécessité du voyage a été démontrée à tous par le fait même. En ce moment Mgr. Gasparri doit être chez Puller et Lacey pour travailler. Je vais dans quelques minutes relancer Scannell et le mettre en rapport avec ces messieurs.

La Commission a repris ses séances. Elle se réunit trois fois par semaine.

Je suis allé hier au soir, jeudi, chez le cardinal pour lui remettre la lettre de l'archevêque d'York et un petit mémoire.

Le Saint-Père a dit à l'abbé Duchesne que le moment était venu de porter une décision. C'est peut-être son désir, mais en réalité personne ne croit une solution possible.¹ Quand le Pape verra la grande difficulté, il se rejettera sur un autre point. Il faut, en ce moment psychologique, que notre campagne en faveur des conférences batte son plein.

On 14th April, Sir Walter Phillimore, who happened to be at Rome at the time, and who was acquainted with the Abbé Portal, wrote as follows :—

I have seen a good bit of the Abbé Portal (whom to know is to love), and on Friday he came to me saying that at an interview which he had had with Cardinal Rampolla he had mentioned me to the Cardinal Secretary of State, who had expressed a wish that I should call. So, at his reception hour yesterday, (Saturday), I went to the Vatican with the Abbé Portal, and had a long half-hour's interview with the Cardinal tête-à-tête. Nothing could be franker or friendlier to me personally. But this by the way. We began somehow on myself and my belongings, my father² and his work on International Law. This led to his introduction of Leo XIII.'s efforts towards international arbitration, and his telegram to the United States in favour of peace with England. And this to 'la paix religieuse,' and the need above all things for 'la charité et la prière.' This led to his speaking of the amount of religious feeling there was in England, and especially among the laity, and our zeal for Christian antiquity and historical research.

Then he passed to the mischief done by the Revolution to the Latin races, Spain which was rather reviving in religious matters, 'la pauvre Italie,' and France, and the revival in this last country among the younger men. I mentioned *Les Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne*,³ and when he found I knew them, he was much pleased; and we spoke together warmly of the need of general union to resist the attacks of infidelity.

¹ Writing a fortnight before, Dom Gasquet says: 'It is difficult to believe that after all the fuss and trouble our work will be thrown away, and that no decision will be given unless the decision be in favour of the Orders, or declaring them doubtful.'—*Leaves from My Diary*, p. 48.

² Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Joseph Phillimore, Bart.

³ *Lettres d'un Curé de Canton; Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne*, by M. Fonsegrive.

Then he spoke of the Pope's great fairness towards us, of the advances he had made and was making, and of the studious impartiality of the Commission which he had appointed on Anglican Orders and their validity.

There is no doubt that the composition of the Commission¹ is most fair. He mentioned the Abbé Duchesne and Mgr. Gasparri (he might have added the Jesuit de Augustinis, and Father Scannell). I said yes, that I was well aware of it, and that I would make it known in England, especially to some of the bishops who honoured me with their friendship or acquaintance.

In this connection I mentioned the Archbishop of York, of whom he said he had heard many good things. Then he asked about the Bishop of Lincoln's Trial, which I described a little, laying stress upon the solemnity of the Court, the Archbishop sitting with his Assessor bishops, the Archbishop's bold bearing, his assertion of his spiritual position, and his putting aside the decrees of secular courts; also the Bishop of Lincoln's refusal to plead before the Privy Council. He said the trial had excited attention even in Italy, but was genuinely astonished when I told him I had among Press cuttings one from a Spanish town in Mexico. He asked after the Bishop of Lincoln. So I spoke of his devotion, his pastoral care, etc., etc.

I mentioned also the Bishops of Peterborough and Rochester. Some good-natured inquiries upon the fairness and want of bitterness in English politics, the necessity that the Church should be democratic (not demagogic), the '*plebs sancta*,' and so forth, brought a most interesting and encouraging interview to an end. Nothing could be simpler or less ceremonious than the whole business, and I conceived a great esteem for the Cardinal, and am very glad to have seen him.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 14 avril 1896.

La père Puller et M. Lacey rendent bien service à l'abbé Duchesne et à Mgr. Gasparri. En dehors de la question de renseignements, leur présence produira, j'espère, tout le bien que nous attendions. L'abbé Duchesne vient de me dire : 'Mais il faut les montrer, il faut qu'ils voient le cardinal Rampolla.' C'est mon plus vif désir . . . j'ai prié Mgr. Gasparri d'aller chez le cardinal Rampolla pour avoir occasion de lui parler de nos

¹ The Commission of Inquiry.

amis. Il l'a fait hier et très gentiment. Le cardinal a été enchanté de tous les détails que Mgr. Gasparri lui a donnés sur la science, la piété, la tenue ecclésiastique des deux anglicans. Dans deux ou trois jours j'irai au Vatican pour demander au cardinal de les recevoir. Le père de Augustinis est excellent ; sa peur est que la question soit portée au Saint Office. S'il est saisi, je ne puis pas croire qu'on le laisse aller jusqu'au bout. Je suis convaincu que nous trouverons auparavant l'occasion de greffer des conférences sur la question des Ordres. La Commission en a pour un mois et demi de travail, au moins.

Hier nous sommes allés aux Catacombes de Sainte Priscille avec le Dr. Bright, un autre anglais, le père Scannell, Lacey, Puller, et Duchesne. Ce dernier nous a servi de cicerone. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire à quel point il a intéressé et charmé tout le monde. Je finis ma lettre chez le père Puller, où je viens de conduire le Dr. Chabot, qui est venu ici pour copier un MS. sur les conciles syriaques. Ils causent en ce moment sur Théodoret, Cyrille, la Procession du Saint Esprit, etc.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 18 avril 1896.

La lettre ¹ de l'archevêque d'York a produit très bon effet, je l'ai bien vu hier chez le cardinal Rampolla. Son Eminence m'a demandé des nouvelles de nos deux amis avec beaucoup d'intérêt, s'ils se plaisaient à Rome, s'ils voyaient souvent Duchesne et Monseigneur Gasparri, si leurs impressions étaient bonnes, etc.²

Si je me rends bien compte de l'état des esprits, voici où nous en sommes. Le Pape voudrait aller de l'avant et la lettre de l'archevêque d'York lui sera très utile. Mais que veut-il faire au juste ? Veut-il vous donner un gage de paix, en prescrivant de reprendre sous condition les ordinations des vôtres, ou veut-il des conférences ? Je ne sais. En dehors du Pape, je crois qu'on désirerait rester dans le statu quo et attendre les événements. Cette politique pourrait être un jour la plus facile à obtenir, vu les grandes difficultés qui surgiront de toutes parts.

¹ The Archbishop of York's letter to the Abbé Portal of the 27th March.

² Abbé Duchesne and Mgr. Gasparri had been authorised to consult Mr. Lacey and Father Puller, and to obtain from them such information as they required for the purposes of the Commission—a permission which inevitably led to a considerable knowledge on the part of Mr. Lacey and Father Puller of what was passing within the Commission.

Elle ne fait notre compte qu'en partie. Nous n'avons rien à gagner de l'attente des événements. Le statu quo au sujet des Ordres ne nous est favorable que si nous obtenons des conférences.

Lord Halifax to Mr. Gladstone

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
April 18, 1896.

I have not thanked you for your kind and interesting letter,¹ because I did not wish to give you the trouble of reading another letter from me till I had something to say of real interest. This I think is now the case, and in order to put you in possession of the facts, I have copied out the correspondence, letters, etc., in chronological order.

I am afraid they must be read to understand the situation, but I sum up shortly the facts. The Pope has appointed a Commission to investigate the question of Anglican Orders. Canon Moyes, Dom Gasquet, and Father David, with a long memorandum against their validity, have been sent to Rome by Cardinal Vaughan. On the opposite side, the Pope has himself put the Abbé Duchesne, Mgr. Gasparri, both favourable to the validity, and the Padre de Augustinis, a Jesuit professor at the Roman University, who has also committed himself in the same sense in a private memorandum to the Pope.

Mgr. Gasparri is a good theologian, but not a historian, the Abbé Duchesne is better acquainted with the history of the first eight centuries than with that of the sixteenth.

Under these circumstances the importance of full and accurate information being in the hands of these gentlemen was obvious, and with this object the Abbé Portal proposed that Father Puller of Cowley, and Mr. Lacey, one of the authors of *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, should go to Rome.

The Archbishop of York was privately consulted; and he thought it was their duty to do so. They accordingly started for Rome on Easter Monday. The Archbishop of York also wrote the letter, of which a copy is enclosed, to the Abbé Portal (who went to Rome in Holy Week), which he was to be at liberty to show to Cardinal Rampolla for the Pope's information, and the Archbishop also wrote the letter to Father Puller to be prefixed to Father Puller's three admirable articles on the Thirty-first Article and the doctrine of the Eucharistic

¹ Of 18th March.

Sacrifice, which have appeared in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. The importance of that letter in view of the question of *intention* in regard to Orders is obvious.

I add to this parcel the two last copies of the *Revue* for your information, and would draw your attention to the publication of Bishop Forbes's *Considerationes Modestæ*, and works of a similar kind, which has been going on since the beginning of the year. This is quite in the direction of the plan mentioned in your letter, about which I am taking steps.

And now I have a request to make. Will you do two things? Will you write a short article on the Armenian question, on its religious side, for the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*; it might take the form of a letter to the editor if more convenient. This would ensure the dissemination of what you would say among the *élite* of the French clergy, and in the highest quarters at Rome. And would you also either write to me or to the editor of the *Review* a letter which might be published in the *Review*, 'Sur le rôle pacificateur de Léon XIII.' (these are the Abbé's words),¹ something as to the general need of peace, of all that such a policy as the Pope appears to have adopted may effect for the reconciliation of Christendom, and with a suggestion that the line taken by Leo XIII. is presenting the Papacy to the English mind in a very different light to what has sometimes been the case, and is one calculated to produce the best and happiest results. If something could be added insisting on all that might be hoped from conferences and explanations, the effect would be still greater. I am assured on the best authority that such a letter from you at this moment would be of importance, and a factor in helping to check the effect of the representations which those who are unfavourable to the English Church make, and will make, to the Pope; it would also assist the Pope in carrying out what we know to be his wishes.

But I need not say more on the importance of this, for it is obvious and beyond question.

On the 20th March, Father Puller wrote again:—

Yesterday (Sunday) we went to the Benedictines of the Bocca di Leone, who are at present in temporary quarters, but for whom the Pope is building a new monastery and college on the Aventine. The Abbot, who is Primate of the whole Benedictine Order, had arrived the evening before from Maredsous. After Mass,

¹ See letter of the Abbé Portal, quoted on p. 284.

we had half an hour with him in his cell. He is a very striking man, and spoke well about truth and unity. There was nothing with which we could not agree. He was interested when I told him I had known Dom Maurus Wolter, the founder of the Congregation.

After our visit to the Benedictines, we went by appointment to see Father Scannell at the English College. We spent an hour with him in the library—he takes a middle line between Cardinal Moyes and the Abbé Duchesne. In the afternoon we had quite a council in my room. The Abbé Duchesne, Mgr. Gasparri and the Abbé Portal came at 3 P.M. Sir Walter Phillimore appeared later. Then, quite unexpectedly, Father Scannell. The Abbé Duchesne brought with him a French layman, M. Fabre, a trained historian, who took the greatest interest in all that went on. We spent three hours going over, with the three members of the Commission, the facts concerning Barlow. That appears to be the subject which is being discussed at the meeting this morning. In the course of the conversation yesterday a passage from Father Sydney Smith's book against our Orders was read out. The Abbé Duchesne said, '*Merae sunt cavillationes.*'

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

21 avril 1896.

Voici encore deux lettres publiées dans le *Chronicle*, mercredi et samedi derniers. C'est le directeur lui-même qui en est l'auteur.

M. Gladstone m'écrit une très aimable lettre et me prie d'aller chez lui pour arranger l'article pour la *Revue*, et la lettre que nous désirons de lui sur le rôle pacificateur de Léon XIII.

M. Ward me dit dans une lettre reçue ce matin 'je suis porté à croire que les Ordres seront déclarés douteux, c'est tout ce que vous pouvez espérer, et c'est ce qui me semble le plus probable.'

Si les choses tournaient ainsi, il faut qu'on donne la raison, ceci est capital. Mais il y a beaucoup à réfléchir ; je crois qu'une déclaration officieuse affirmant qu'après avoir tout entendu, ni la commission, ni le Pape n'ont cru possible d'accepter les conclusions du mémoire présenté par le chanoine Moyes, etc., serait peut-être ce qu'il y aurait de mieux, mais il y a le temps pour penser à tout cela. J'ai écrit à l'évêque de Clifton¹ et je dois déjeuner avec lui vendredi.

¹ Rt. Rev. William Brownlow, Bishop of Clifton ; died 9th November 1891.

The letters in the *Daily Chronicle*¹ here mentioned are alluded to in a speech I delivered on 21st April, at a general meeting of the English Church Union. I give the passage :—

In speaking of the Commission which by the desire of the Pope is now sitting in Rome to investigate the question of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church, the writer implies that the Commission is due to the passionate insistence with which Lord Halifax and a section of the English Church have been seeking to obtain a recognition of the validity of those Orders from the Holy See, and the motive which is assigned for such alleged action on my part is the desire to obtain from Rome an assertion that the English clergy are in possession of the power enjoyed by a validly-ordained priesthood, to consecrate the Holy Eucharist, and to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We desire the reunion of Christendom, and we desire it with passionate earnestness. And because we desire it, and because we have seen that if ever Rome and England are to be brought together it can only be accomplished by finding some common ground on which both sides may be brought into contact, and because such a ground seemed best supplied by the question of Orders, we have been glad that the question has been raised. Who can doubt that if in consequence of having all the facts brought before it, the Roman Church were to recognise the validity of our Orders, one great obstacle in the way of reunion would be removed. It is, then, as a means to this end, the reunion of Christendom, not because we have any doubt as to the Orders of the English Church, or require a recognition from Rome to add to our complete assurance of their perfect validity, that the question has been brought forward in France, and is now being discussed at Rome. How completely the Pope understands this is proved by the whole course of his action, and by his having placed on the Commission the Abbé Duchesne, Mgr. Gasparri, Father Scannell, and the Padre de Augustinis, all of whom are known to be more or less favourable to the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England. No doubt there are others, and countrymen of our own, who wish for, and would rejoice at, a condemnation. I wish it were not so for their own sake, and for the sake of truth and peace; but the injury that will be done, should they succeed in their object, will not be to us or to the Church of England. Our love for her, our confidence in her, will remain what they were, nay, they will

¹ See also *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. ii. p. 119.

be increased, should any condemnation be issued : the blow and the injury will be to the wider hope that Leo XIII. has done so much to encourage, and for the realisation of which we know from his own words, he so earnestly longs. May God, whose over-ruling providence has made itself almost visible to those who have been concerned in the events of the last three years, avert such a misfortune, and guide the minds of all, whether in Rome or in England, especially the minds of all in authority, to use the present investigation as an occasion, in the interests of truth and peace, for the institution of conferences between accredited theologians on both sides for the careful, patient, and charitable discussion of all the difficulties and misunderstandings which at present keep us apart.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE, S.W.,
22 avril 1896.

Je pars à l'instant pour Oxford ; dites au père Puller que je dois être à Cowley demain matin ; demain soir, je serai à Bristol, vendredi je déjeune avec l'évêque de Clifton, et vendredi soir je vais chez M. Gladstone à Hawarden. J'espère retourner à Londres samedi soir. Dites au père Puller que j'ai causé longuement avec l'évêque de Stepney¹ hier ; tout le monde est on ne peut plus intéressé à ce qui se passe à Rome.

Que la commission refuse de se prononcer pour aucune condamnation, et qu'il soit dit officiellement que le Pape a décidé en conséquence que toute ordination de membre du clergé anglican se soumettant à Rome sera faite *sub conditione*. Voilà, il me semble, la meilleure solution. D'un côté rien ne serait décidé, et de l'autre tout aurait été décidé. Rome ne serait pas liée par une décision formelle que les ordinations sont douteuses, et il serait très possible que si on arrivait à un accord, plus tard on serait content, d'un côté comme de l'autre, de ne pas se trouver entravé par la difficulté qu'entraînerait une décision formelle.² Je crois aussi qu'une décision formelle en faveur du doute agacerait les nôtres.

Demandez à Puller ce qu'il pense à cet égard.

¹ Bishop Brown, now of Bristol.

² The Abbé had already incidentally alluded, in connection with the internal discipline of the Roman Church, to the possibility of a decision limited to the ordination *sub conditione* of Anglican clergy submitting to Rome. He had in the same letter gone on to say : ' Mgr. Gasparri n'a pas encore vu le Pape. Duchesne ira sans tarder chez le Cardinal Rampolla. Ah ! si M. Gladstone était ici, comme il enlèverait la position.'

Friday, the 24th, I saw the Bishop of Clifton and I tell the Abbé Portal in a letter a day or two later :—

J'ai vu l'évêque de Clifton vendredi, mais je ne sais pas s'il est capable de nous servir.¹ Au sujet des Ordres il a dit que ce n'était pas comme si tout le clergé anglican partageait les idées et les croyances du 'parti ritualiste,' (je cite les expressions dont il s'est servi), et que je ne pourrai pas me faire une idée de l'impression qui serait produite parmi les siens si on était forcé à croire que les individus qui n'avaient pas la plus mince croyance dans la présence réelle étaient capables de consacrer l'Eucharistie. Mettant la question du fait de côté (vous comprenez que c'est un fait que je n'admettrais pas présenté de cette façon), le raisonnement pour ce qu'il vaut, équivaut au raisonnement de ceux qui nieraient la vérité des sacrements parce qu'il y a de mauvais chrétiens, ou la vérité du sacerdoce parce qu'il y a de mauvais prêtres.

¹ We had wished him to write for the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*.

CHAPTER XII

MR. GLADSTONE'S SOLILOQUIUM—THE ABBÉ DUCHESNE'S DEGREE
AT CAMBRIDGE—HIS VISIT TO MR. GLADSTONE IN COMPANY
WITH FATHER PULLER.

THE preceding correspondence explains the course of events up to the 24th of April. I had seen the Bishop of Clifton that day, as detailed in the last chapter, and in the afternoon I went on to Hawarden. I arrived there late, but had some conversation with Mr. Gladstone before going to bed. The next morning, St. Mark's Day, was like summer. Mrs. Drew¹ and I went to church together, I then explored the old castle, and after breakfast I had a long conversation with Mr. Gladstone till luncheon. As will be seen from preceding letters he had been interested in the action which the Abbé Portal and I had initiated, ever since it had been brought to his knowledge, and he was not unwilling to write such a letter as I had suggested, but hesitated to do so lest such a communication from him should not be agreeable to the Pope, and he should seem to be intruding in business which was not directly his own. We had, however, some discussion as to the form such a letter, if it were written, might take. After luncheon I walked round the park, and later Mr. Gladstone took me to see St. Deiniol's, the library he had founded for the purpose of assisting clerical studies at Hawarden. There was more conversation in the garden before I left, Mrs. Gladstone and Mrs. Drew driving me to the station. I got back to London late that night, and the next day I wrote to the Abbé.

¹ Miss Mary Gladstone, wife of the Rev. Harry Drew.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

27 avril 1896.

M. Gladstone s'intéresse vivement à tout ce qui se passe à Rome. Il a parlé du Pape d'une manière qui vous aurait fait plaisir. Je suis sûr qu'il est prêt à faire son possible, et même je ne désespérerais pas d'un voyage à Rome si c'était nécessaire. Sir Walter Phillimore, que j'ai vu hier, pourrait beaucoup à cet égard. En attendant, M. Gladstone est tout disposé à écrire soit au Pape soit au Cardinal Rampolla ; seulement il ne veut rien faire sans être assuré qu'une telle communication serait agréable au Saint Père. Il a même ajouté qu'il voudrait savoir quelles seraient les choses dans une telle lettre qui seraient bien reçues à Rome. Je lui ai affirmé qu'on serait très content au Vatican qu'il exprimât ses idées avec une complète liberté et la plus grande franchise, mais il ne veut pas croire que même à son âge et dans sa position il n'y aurait aucune inconvenance dans une telle communication de sa part au Saint Père. Il m'a affirmé que s'il recevait des assurances de Rome, qu'on ne serait pas mécontent d'une communication de la sorte, il s'y prêterait de bon cœur.

Maintenant faut-il une lettre qui contiendrait un mémoire pour informer le Pape sur l'état des esprits en Angleterre, avec d'autres observations générales sur notre histoire, etc. Songez à tout ceci, et écrivez-moi le plus tôt possible.

Un voyage de M. Gladstone à Rome aurait cet inconvénient que cela ferait beaucoup de bruit. C'est M. Gladstone lui-même qui m'a fait cette observation. J'avais répété votre phrase ! 'Oh, si M. Gladstone était ici.'

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 28 avril 1896.

Mgr. Gasparri a trouvé le Pape dans d'excellentes dispositions. Notre ami a parlé dans les meilleurs termes de Puller et Lacey, au point de vue de la science, comme au point de vue de la piété et de la tenue ecclésiastique. D'eux il a passé à tous les 'ritualistes,' disant qu'il y avait là un grand parti, le parti de l'avenir, etc. Il a ajouté très finement : 'Saint Père, ils sont à la porte de la maison, tout près de nous, et c'est au père de famille, par ses caresses et par son affection, à les faire entrer et à ouvrir la porte.' 'Cette porte,' lui a dit le Saint Père, 'nous l'ouvrons toute grande—spalanchiamo.'

Que ce serait beau ces deux vieillards, M. Gladstone et Léon XIII., traitant ensemble de l'union des églises et posant les premiers fondements de cette union future. Que Dieu nous inspire tous, mon cher ami, car nous arrivons au grand moment des décisions dont les résultats seront immenses. Quoi qu'il arrive, vous pourrez bien vous rendre le témoignage d'avoir fait tout ce qu'il était humainement possible de faire. Ayons confiance. Dès votre lettre reçue, je verrai ce qui me paraîtra possible, je prendrai conseil de nos amis, et à la garde de Dieu.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

1 mai 1896.

Votre lettre du 29 vient d'arriver. La situation dépend du Pape, et de lui seul. Nous n'avons rien à attendre des catholiques anglais. J'ai vu M. Ward ce soir. Il a vu le cardinal¹ et lui a parlé d'un article qu'il était disposé à écrire pour la *Revue*. Le cardinal lui a dit de ne pas le faire. Il ne veut pas que M. Ward écrive dans la *Revue*. Cela donnerait l'impression, a-t-il dit, qu'il se prête à l'idée d'une réunion en corps. Ainsi M. Ward ne veut rien faire pour la *Revue* ; j'aurais cru que c'était une chose sur laquelle M. Ward aurait bien pu se décider sans prendre avis. Comme le Saint Père est mal servi par ceux qui devraient être les premiers à l'aider dans ses grands desseins ! Il faut bien le dire, on ne peut trouver nulle part une politique plus insensée et plus étroite, une politique qui manque plus complètement de charité, et de vraie sagesse divine que celle du cardinal Vaughan. Le cardinal et la plupart des catholiques anglais se trouvent tout à fait en désaccord avec les idées qu'exprimait jadis feu le cardinal Wiseman, et avec celles qui ont déjà permis au Saint Père de faire plus pour la réunion de l'église d'Angleterre avec Rome que tous les papes depuis le seizième siècle.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

1 mai 1896.

Hier au soir, je suis allé chez le cardinal Rampolla. Une démonstration de M. Gladstone fera le plus grand plaisir au Vatican. J'en étais sûr d'avance, mais le cardinal Rampolla m'en a donné hier l'assurance formelle. Je lui ai demandé son

¹ Cardinal Vaughan.

avis sur la forme. Il préfère que ce ne soit pas une lettre adressée au Saint Père, cela lui paraît en dehors des usages.

Une seule remarque à propos de ce qui touche à la réunion de Lambeth :¹ il est important, ce me semble, d'en parler, M. Gladstone devrait énoncer le fait comme présentant une occasion, ménagée par la Providence aux deux églises. L'église anglicane pourra en profiter particulièrement et manifester avec autorité les désirs d'union qui sont dans ses traditions.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

6 mai 1896.

La Commission² va finir dans une dizaine de jours, peut-être avant. Mgr. Gasparri me disait que tout de suite après, les résultats seraient transmis au Saint Office, et qu'une sentence ne serait pas prononcée avant un an. Duchesne n'est pas du même avis. Il croit que les travaux de la commission seront soumis à une Commission de Cardinaux, et qu'avant peu de temps il y aura une solution.

Si le Saint Office est saisi je crois qu'il n'y a qu'à partir. Si au contraire la question est portée devant une commission de cardinaux, il y aurait peut-être intérêt à rester encore quelque temps.

J'ai eu une conversation excellente avec l'abbé Duchesne. Je l'ai prié d'écrire un mémoire pour le Pape dans lequel il dirait ses impressions sur le père Puller, Lacey, etc., ses idées sur l'union en corps, etc., etc. Il m'a dit avec beaucoup de cœur qu'il le ferait, qu'après la clôture de la Commission il agirait et se montrerait.

Le père Puller et M. Lacey viennent de chez l'abbé Duchesne. Ils ont abordé la question du rite ensemble, et l'abbé Duchesne a constaté que des choses qui auraient dû être dites ne l'ont pas été. Il va faire rouvrir la discussion là-dessus. L'abbé a été souffrant ces jours-ci. Sur ce point d'ailleurs il s'en est rapporté à Mgr. Gasparri et au père de Augustinis.

It is obvious that the question of the rite, and the intention with which it was framed, could not be fully discussed

¹ The meeting of the Bishops in communion with Canterbury to commemorate the thirteen-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of St. Augustine.

² The Commission of Inquiry

without an inquiry into the meaning and intention of the Thirty-first Article and other formularies of the Church of England. The subject had been fully and carefully gone into by Father Puller in his pamphlet, *English Ordinations and the Sacrifice of the Mass*, to which the Archbishop of York had written a preface. On this subject the Dean of Canterbury,¹ who may be usefully quoted as a witness from an independent quarter, in his recent volume, *Principles of the Reformation* (p. 50), makes the following statement:—

‘The Confession [of Augsburg] expressly alleges that an opinion prevailed—which had led to an infinite increase of private Masses—that Christ by His Passion had made satisfaction for original sin, but had instituted the Mass as an oblation to be made for daily sins, mortal and venial; and that from thence flowed the current opinion that the Mass is a work putting away the sins of the living and the dead *ex opere operato*.’

In reference to this teaching, as the Dean points out, the Confession makes the statement, repeated in our own Article XXXI., that our Lord was a sacrifice ‘*not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men,*’ in order to lay down in the most explicit manner what is asserted in the words both of the Book of Common Prayer and the Article, that Christ ‘by His one oblation of Himself once offered made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,’ and ‘that there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone.’

But such a proposition is one which no Catholic theologian would deny.²

Unfortunately, Father Puller’s pamphlet had not been

¹ The Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D.

² ‘The sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, to all Christian minds, to all Christian thought, in every aspect of the Christian dispensation, historically, devotionally, practically, are full, complete, and superabundant; His suffering completely atoned for man’s offence against God, and purchased all necessary grace for every human being. He is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. For faithful and unbeliever, for the elect and the non-elect. His Blood has made satisfaction. For original sin, for actual sin, and for all the punishment due to sin, He has cancelled the account that was against us, nailing it to His Cross.’ Sermon by Rt. Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport, 3rd May 1908.

read even by the Abbé Duchesne, a fact which may explain the surprise expressed by Abbot Gasquet, after a session of the Commission at which the rite had been discussed, at 'these Frenchmen acting on behalf of the Anglicans having nothing more to say than has been so far brought up' (*Leaves from My Diary*, p. 59).

Correspondence was still going on with Mr. Gladstone in regard to the letter I had asked him to write. Having heard from the Abbé Portal that such a letter would be acceptable at the Vatican (see the Abbé's letter of the 1st May), I had suggested paying a second visit to Hawarden to discuss the contents of the letter, and the person to whom it should be addressed.

Mr. Gladstone, in reply, proposed my spending Sunday, the 10th, at Hawarden, and concluded his letter by saying that he might in the meantime be revolving his thoughts on the subject, adding that the objection to his volunteering anything to the Court of Rome, without a responsible assurance that such a communication would not be disagreeable to the Pope, would also apply to his writing anything to either of our Archbishops.

I went down in consequence to Hawarden on the 9th. Mr. Gladstone met me at the station, and we had some conversation before and again after dinner. Sunday, a most beautiful day, we went to church at eight, and again at eleven. I walked back with Mr. Gladstone from church, and then and after luncheon had a long conversation with him on the subject of reunion and the purpose of my visit. He promised to consider the question of what he might write, and when he had done so I should hear from him. After luncheon he drove me round the Park and woods. Hawarden was looking in the greatest beauty, and I came away more than satisfied with my visit, impressed with Mr. Gladstone's wonderful vigour, his extraordinary keenness of perception and interest in all matters affecting religion and the welfare of the Church, and glad to have seen him and Mrs. Gladstone again in the midst of the beautiful surroundings to which they were so much attached.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 8 mai 1896.

La Commission¹ est donc finie : j'ai vu l'abbé Duchesne ce matin. Je l'ai prié de vouloir bien dire au cardinal Rampolla trois choses : (1) la bonne impression que ces messieurs² produisent, et les services qu'ils ont rendus à la commission ; (2) qu'avec des hommes pareils il faut songer à une union en corps, et non à des conversions individuelles ; (3) qu'il entrevoit la possibilité de s'entendre et que des conférences sont désirables.

Je suis sûr que l'abbé dira cela. Il parlera aussi de la Commission, et fera ses réserves pour un supplément d'informations qu'il juge nécessaire. La nécessité d'un supplément d'informations a été prouvée péremptoirement par la trouvaille de Frere,³ et par la découverte du mandat royal de consacrer Barlow. Ces réserves de l'abbé Duchesne seront très sérieuses.

Mgr. Gasparri s'en va lundi ou mardi—le père David ne tardera pas à faire comme lui, mais Moyes et Gasquet restent pour opérer des recherches. . . . Le cardinal Galimberti est mort. Je le regrette pour nous. Je suis allé hier chez le cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli, une vieille connaissance de Lisbonne comme vous savez. Il a été parfait. Il s'intéresse bien à nos affaires. Il avait entendu parler de nos amis,⁴ avec les plus grands éloges. J'en ai profité pour lui demander de les recevoir. Ce qu'il a accepté de bon cœur. Nous irons demain. L'abbé Duchesne a été très content de cette démarche. D'après lui comme d'après Mgr. Mourey—le Cardinal Scraphino Vannutelli serait un 'papabile' très sérieux.

Sur le conseil de l'abbé Duchesne, le père Puller et M. Lacey sont allés voir le père de Augustinis. Celui-ci a été très réservé, mais au fond il n'a pu se défendre d'être bien impressionné et il l'a dit à l'abbé Duchesne. Il a même ajouté qu'il serait souhaitable que nos amis vissent le Pape.

¹ The Commission of Inquiry.

² Father Puller and Mr. Lacey.

³ Rev. Walter Frere, head of the Community of the Resurrection, who had discovered in some Episcopal Registers traces of re-ordination in the reign of Mary. See his book, *The Marian Reaction*. He communicated this discovery to Father Puller, who immediately laid the information before the Abbé Duchesne to be communicated to the Commission. See Mr. Lacey, *A Roman Diary*, p. 57.

⁴ Father Puller and Mr. Lacey.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

9 mai 1896.

L'entrevue de l'abbé Duchesne avec le cardinal Rampolla a été excellente. Il a dit tout ce que je lui avais demandé de dire.

Le cardinal a dit que le père Puller et M. Lacey devaient rester, qu'ils devaient voir des cardinaux, le voir lui-même. De ce côté donc c'est parfait. Nous devons même conclure de là que les résultats de la Commission¹ permettent de continuer à marcher dans notre sens.

Ce soir avec le père Puller et Lacey nous sommes allés chez le cardinal Vannutelli. Il nous a dit : (1) qu'il faisait partie de la Commission² nommée par le Saint-Père pour examiner la question ; (2) qu'il se mettait à notre disposition ; (3) qu'il fallait absolument s'unir, que l'Angleterre était une puissance énorme, etc.

Demain j'irai voir son frère.³ Vous voyez, mon cher ami, qu'il y a tout lieu d'espérer que nous sommes en bonne voie. Le cardinal Vaughan sera-t-il de la Commission ? Je l'ignore. Que Dieu nous garde.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 16 mai 1896.

Le Pape veut publier son Encyclique⁴ sur l'Unité dans les premiers jours de juin. Dans cette encyclique il y aura, dit-on, un point qui nécessitera des études sur vos Ordres et qui rend indispensable l'avis de la Commission Cardinalice. En ce moment on doit sans doute imprimer les rapports, etc., de la Commission d'Enquête. Aussitôt cela fait, et les imprimés distribués, la Commission Cardinalice fonctionnera, c'est à dire, vers le 20 ou le 25.

Le père Puller et M. Lacey font ici de la bonne besogne. Le père Puller a vu hier les deux Cardinaux Vannutelli, avec lesquels il a causé à fond. Il en est revenu enchanté et tout ému. Le cardinal Seraphino l'a embrassé en le quittant et l'a reconduit jusqu'à la porte. Tous les deux lui ont dit : vous pouvez être sûr qu'on ne fera rien contre vous. Le cardinal Seraphino

¹ The Commission of Inquiry.² The Commission of Cardinals.³ Cardinal Serafino Vannutelli.⁴ The Encyclical *De Unitate*, known from its opening words as the *Satis Cognitum*.

m'avait dit à moi le matin, en parlant de la *Revue*, c'est vraiment une époque nouvelle qui commence.

Lacey travaille douze heures par jour depuis cinq jours. Il a écrit un supplément à la *De Hierarchia* et en ce moment il écrit un mémoire pour les cardinaux.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 17 mai 1896.

J'ai vu hier le cardinal Rampolla qui a été parfait. Nous avons parlé de Gladstone. Je lui ai dit que, sûrement, Gladstone ferait quelque chose, mais que vous n'étiez pas d'accord sur le mode. Je lui ai annoncé une lettre de vous, et je lui ai remis une lettre de M. Birkbeck ¹ pour qu'elle parvînt au Pape. Je dois la reprendre lors de ma prochaine visite.

Le père Puller et Lacey vont au Mont Cassin—they reviendront mercredi. Ce soir j'irai voir le cardinal Parocchi.

The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to Lord Halifax

HAWARDEN CASTLE,
CHESTER, May 20, 1896.

In deference to your desire, I have had no difficulty in putting on paper the impressions which have been made upon my mind by the recent and current proceedings at Rome on the subject of Anglican consecrations.

They belong to the experience of a long life passed to a certain extent in association with kindred subjects. There is nothing in them which I wish to conceal, but, on the other hand, pronouncing as they may seem to do upon subjects of high importance, they are not such as I ought to obtrude.

I place the paper in your hands subject to two conditions only :—

(1) That it is not to be made known to any one in authority at Rome without what you deem an adequate intimation of desire to see it.

(2) That it shall not be made public until after the private use of it in any quarter where such use may be desirable.

¹ Mr. Birkbeck when in Rome in 1895, and subsequently, had been in communication with Cardinal Rampolla in regard to Russian affairs. See letter from Constantine Pobiedonostzeff (Chief Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod), p. 223.

I have wished to make my sense of the part taken by His Holiness quite independent of the issues which may be reached.

I feel, however, that after the steps recently taken, the question cannot remain as it was. If it is not better, it will be worse.

A very competent authority informs me that the Abbé Duchesne is the most learned ecclesiastic in France.

The following day, in reply to a telegram from me, suggesting that the paper might contain a reference to possible conferences, Mr. Gladstone added :—

I have not complied with your wish that I should refer to ulterior steps, conferences and the like. I am in all things for progress slow but solid. To effect one real step in the direction of reunion, after the events of the last five hundred years, would be enough to lead any man contentedly to lay down his head and die. But further, I feel sure that reference to ulterior measures at this juncture by me would be especially mischievous. It would equally inflame ultra Romans and rabid Protestants, and would probably be fatal to all progress. My belief is that cardinal Vaughan and his band will omit no opportunity, and will not greatly scruple any means of defeating the Pope in his present purpose.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla

79 EATON SQUARE,
LONDRES, le 20 mai 1896.

Je reviens d'une visite à M. Gladstone à Hawarden, et je ne puis pas me refuser le plaisir de rendre compte à votre Eminence, des sentiments qui animent M. Gladstone, au sujet de tout ce que fait Sa Sainteté en ce moment pour la réunion des Eglises. M. Gladstone en a parlé avec un grand enthousiasme, et une grande reconnaissance. Chaque fois qu'il abordait le sujet, il répétait avec chaleur à quel point il était pénétré par les grands sentiments et par la charité du Pape.

Le Saint Père, disait-il, montre un vrai courage, en se mettant à la tête d'un mouvement qui a pour but la réconciliation de l'Angleterre avec Rome, après un schisme qui a duré plus de trois cents ans. C'est magnifique d'être le premier dans une telle œuvre, on y voit la main de Dieu, et je me sens profondément ému d'un tel spectacle.

Léon XIII. donne la preuve d'une grande largeur de vue, et d'une compréhension de ce qui touche le bien de l'Eglise et les nécessités du temps présent qui sont vraiment admirables. Plus, disait-il, on peut unir les croyants et les hommes de bonne foi, plus on se fortifie contre les attaques de l'incrédulité, et plus on met l'Eglise à l'abri de ceux qui l'attaquent et plus on se prépare pour les dangers dont elle est menacée dans l'avenir.

Il citait alors les belles paroles des Encycliques de Léon XIII., et il répétait, que le Pape avait fait renaître dans beaucoup de cœurs des espérances qu'on avait cru pendant ces dernières années bien éloignées.

Ensuite, il disait combien il s'intéressait aux travaux de la Commission d'Enquête sur la validité des Ordres, les bons résultats qu'on pouvait espérer si on arrivait à une solution favorable, et l'appui qu'une telle solution prêterait pour d'autres conférences. Il signalait alors l'occasion que donnerait la réunion des Evêques anglicans à Lambeth l'année prochaine, pour la manifestation d'un désir d'union, de chaque côté, occasion qui semblait vraiment ménagée par la Providence dans ce dessein.

Quand on se rappelle l'attitude de M. Gladstone à certaines époques dans le passé, votre Eminence comprendra à quel point Léon XIII. a su s'attirer la confiance des esprits en Angleterre.

M. Gladstone s'est alors retiré chez lui, car à l'époque de ma dernière visite il était un peu fatigué, votre Eminence n'ignore pas qu'il a quatre vingt six ans ; mais, dans le cours de la journée, il m'a appelé auprès de lui, et m'a fait voir un mémoire qu'il avait rédigé sur certains points se rattachant à la position de l'Eglise anglicane, au retour qui s'était opéré en Angleterre vers les anciennes croyances, à l'attitude de Léon XIII. et à la reconnaissance qui lui est due, au résultat qu'on devait espérer de l'enquête sur la validité des Ordres, et à la nécessité de l'union, si on voulait défendre d'une manière efficace la foi chrétienne contre les attaques de l'incrédulité.

Je lui ai demandé d'envoyer ce qu'il avait écrit, d'une manière privée à votre Eminence, en lui donnant l'assurance, comme j'ai cru pouvoir le faire d'après ce que m'avait dit l'abbé Portal, que votre Eminence serait très contente d'avoir les idées de toute personne occupant une position telle que la sienne, sur un sujet de si grande importance, et surtout ses idées à lui qui auraient une valeur tout-à-fait exceptionnelle ; mais il a hésité, craignant d'être indiscret, et ne se sentant pas suffisamment assuré qu'une telle démarche de sa part serait agréable à votre Eminence.

Je l'ai aussi prié de publier quelque chose dans le même sens, soit en forme de lettre, soit d'une autre façon, et je suis sûr qu'il le ferait avec plaisir s'il n'éprouvait pas la même crainte de sembler s'arroger une position qui ne lui appartient pas.

Je ne puis terminer cette lettre (pour la longueur de laquelle je dois demander l'indulgence de votre Eminence) sans dire encore une fois, à quel point je me sens reconnaissant de la bonté qui m'accorde le privilège de m'adresser à votre Eminence avec une si grande liberté.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE,
22 mai 1896.

Voici le Mémoire de M. Gladstone. Il faut que vous et Puller et Lacey le traduisiez en français. Je vous avertis que c'est une rude besogne que vous avez sur les bras. Aussitôt que vous aurez lu ce *Soliloquium* et que vous vous serez bien rendu compte de son contenu faites moi savoir de suite quand vous voulez qu'il paraisse dans la presse anglaise.

Le mémoire est très bon pour nous. Est-il aussi bon pour Rome ? Voilà ce que je ne sais pas, mais je crois que M. Gladstone fera encore quelque chose pour des conférences plus tard, et qu'il écrira aussi au cardinal Rampolla, si j'ai une réponse de ce dernier. J'ajoute une lettre pour le cardinal Rampolla qui accompagnera la traduction du *Soliloquium*. J'espère que vous en serez content. J'ai fait de mon mieux.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 28 mai 1896.

Le mémoire est parfait, je dis parfait, sans aucune exagération et fera le plus grand bien. Hier au soir j'ai été porter au cardinal Rampolla une traduction pour laquelle nous avons fait de notre mieux, le père Puller, Lacey et moi.

Si M. Gladstone avait vu le plaisir qu'a éprouvé le cardinal Rampolla, il aurait peut-être moins de scrupule à traiter plus directement de cette grande affaire de l'Union avec le Vatican. Le cardinal a été très touché, en particulier, des sentiments exprimés à l'égard de Léon XIII. par votre illustre homme d'Etat. A mon avis, le mouvement entre dans une nouvelle phase. Il

va prendre des proportions et une force que personne ne pouvait prévoir. Les dispositions ici sont excellentes, j'entends dans les milieux les plus élevés. Mais pour que ces dispositions puissent se traduire par des faits, il faut que le Pape trouve un grand appui chez vous. Il faut qu'il soit à même de répondre aux opposants, qu'il ne peut pourtant pas repousser vos témoignages en faveur de l'union. Toute notre politique est là. Je ne sais rien de nouveau. L'abbé Duchesne est plein d'espoir, non pas pour une définition formelle en faveur de la validité de vos Ordres, mais pour la réussite finale de l'œuvre. Rien de contraire ne sera posé. Le Pape a en mains des documents théologiques qui lui permettent de s'orienter vers l'union. L'archevêque d'York et M. Gladstone lui fournissent des appuis extérieurs puissants. Le cardinal Rampolla m'a parlé hier de la *Revue* en très bons termes, avec beaucoup d'intérêt.

PS.—Nous avons déjeuné aujourd'hui chez l'abbé Duchesne. De là je suis allé chez le cardinal Vannutelli, il a été très bien. J'ai battu en brèche directement le cardinal Mazzella. Je suis encore revenu sur notre position exacte, sur le rôle que joue dans le mouvement la question des Ordres. Pour prouver la sincérité des vôtres, car c'est là le terrain exploité par nos adversaires, j'ai cité, outre votre nom, celui de l'archevêque d'York et celui de Gladstone, enfin, j'ai essayé de montrer que, même dans l'hypothèse où vous ne seriez pas sincères, l'Eglise romaine n'aurait rien à perdre. Le cardinal Vannutelli semble me conseiller de rester encore. Hier le cardinal Rampolla à qui je parlais de mon prochain départ pour tâter le terrain, ne m'a pas indiqué de désir dans ce sens. S'il n'y a pas de raison particulière, je crois que ma place, en ce moment, est à Paris. A propos du mémoire Gladstone, il va y avoir un coup de feu et encore un autre à propos de l'encyclique qui paraîtra au milieu de juillet. Le père Puller et Lacey pourraient rester quelques jours de plus, sous la conduite de l'abbé Duchesne ; nous allons décider cela demain ou après demain.

Oh, mon ami, quelle torture que cette traduction de Gladstone. J'ai écrit, d'abord, une première fois en langage quelconque sous la dictée du père Puller. J'ai repris ce premier travail, pour le remettre en français. Ce second travail a été discuté entre nous, et puis j'ai écrit le tout au propre d'un bout à l'autre, pour la troisième fois ! J'y ai passé seul ou avec ces messieurs, lundi 7 heures, mardi 12 heures, mercredi 9 heures, total 28 heures !

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 2 juin 1896.

J'ai vu hier le cardinal Rampolla et le Cardinal Parocchi. Le premier avait été indisposé les deux jours précédents, et je n'avais pu le voir. Ma conversation a été des plus intéressantes avec le cardinal Parocchi. Dans notre première entrevue, il m'avait dit au sujet de la *Revue*, avec mille précautions, qu'il me trouvait un peu indulgent. Cette parole m'avait fortifié dans mes suppositions que le cardinal ne nous était pas très favorable. Il est classé dans l'opposition et, de fait, ses blâmes au sujet de la politique pontificale en France et au sujet de l'union avec les Eglises Orientales sont publics. Je ne voulais pas partir sans le revoir, d'autant plus que j'ai cru comprendre chez le cardinal Rampolla, que le cardinal Vicaire n'avait pas gardé pour lui ses réflexions sur la *Revue*, et qu'au Vatican aussi on croyait l'avoir pour adversaire. Entre temps, j'avais prié MM. Puller et Lacey d'aller le voir. Je me suis donc présenté chez Son Eminence pour la remercier d'avoir bien voulu recevoir si aimablement nos amis. 'Ne me remerciez pas,' m'a dit tout de suite le cardinal, 'j'ai été très heureux de voir ces messieurs, j'ai été très heureux de tout ce qu'ils m'ont dit et j'ai admiré leur foi, leur loyauté, etc.' J'ai appuyé sur la chanterelle et j'ai généralisé ces excellentes appréciations. Le cardinal m'a parlé de l'archevêque d'York, de sa droiture, de son esprit de foi en termes parfaits. 'Dans la *Revue*, vous devriez raconter le fait de la rupture. On ignore trop que la Bulle *Regnans in Excelsis*¹ a été publiée sans, pour ainsi dire, que le Pape prît conseil, et que les hommes au courant des choses étaient hostiles à une telle démarche. Demandez donc à l'abbé Duchesne de faire étudier les correspondances diplomatiques de l'époque. On y trouvera la preuve que les Anglais ont toujours eu des amis à Rome. Sous Pie v., c'était un peu comme aujourd'hui, une démarche inopportune pouvait compromettre tout. Un conseiller quelconque, ayant plus de zèle que de science, a poussé le Pape et il a lancé la Bulle.² Il aurait ensuite voulu en empêcher la publication, mais ses ordres sont arrivés trop tard. Voyez la brochure du père Carini sur Ormaneto³ vous y trouverez des

¹ The Bull excommunicating Elizabeth.

² Something not altogether dissimilar may have happened in our own time.

³ Monsignor Niccolò Ormaneto Veronese, *rescovo di Padua, nunzio apostolico alla corte di Filippo II., Rè di Spagna, 1572-1577.* By P. Francesco M. Carini, S.J., 1894. Some interesting extracts from this pamphlet were printed in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. ii. pp. 372-376.

choses intéressantes. Je vous autorise, si vous le jugez à propos, à publier dans la *Revue* la traduction d'un sermon que je viens de prononcer sur l'union des Eglises. Il va paraître en brochure.'

Moi, je n'avais pas prononcé dix paroles. Nous avons encore causé quelques minutes et je suis parti enchanté. Lacey qui est entré après moi, a reçu une seconde édition de tout ce qu'on m'avait dit. Tout cela est très important, il y a là des indices d'un état d'esprit on ne peut plus favorable. Pour moi, cet état d'esprit existait vaguement chez tous les cardinaux ou à peu près chez tous dès le commencement. On ne voulait pas une condamnation, on voulait même une démarche favorable. La bonne impression que Puller et Lacey produisent—il n'est pas possible de dire à quel point ces messieurs édifient par leur simplicité, par leur esprit de foi—avait fortifié tous les bons désirs. Le mémoire Gladstone achève le tout, et fournira, j'espère, à la cour de Rome l'occasion de témoigner ses bons sentiments.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

ROME, 7 juin 1896.

Nous avons assisté à la Messe du Saint-Père ce matin. Le cardinal Parocchi, que j'ai vu hier, a été toujours fort intéressant. Il m'a dit que depuis Henri VIII. il ne s'était pas produit un tel mouvement en faveur de l'union. Vous feriez bien, je crois, d'écrire au Cardinal Parocchi pour le remercier de l'excellent accueil qu'il a fait au père Puller et à Lacey. Je lui ai transmis des compliments de votre part, il vous renvoie les siens. Parlez lui de la bonne volonté qu'il y a chez vous, et de la nécessité de vous aider par quelques démarches. Enfin dites que, de votre côté, on a fait tout le possible pour créer des relations, et que c'est à Rome à agir maintenant. Le cardinal Rampolla recevra ces messieurs demain à une heure.

Avant-hier matin, j'ai dit la sainte Messe à la crypte de St. Pierre. Sept sœurs de charité, Lacey et Puller et M. Fabre¹ y assistaient. Inutile de vous dire que j'ai bien pensé à vous. Le cardinal Seraphino Vannutelli a dit hier au père Puller, que le dossier de l'affaire allait lui être remis demain et qu'il aurait à s'en occuper. L'encyclique qui d'abord devait paraître fin mai, puis dans les premiers jours de juin, est renvoyée à la fin de ce même mois. Le cardinal Rampolla attend avec impa-

¹ A friend of the Abbé Duchesne.

tience les différentes appréciations de la presse sur Gladstone. Je lui ai annoncé que la *Revue* les porterait.

Extracts from other correspondence at this time, bearing on the subject of reunion, are not without interest.

Mr. Purcell, the author of Cardinal Manning's *Life*, wrote :—

Reunion would immensely strengthen the principles of Christianity : now, as twenty years ago, the chief obstacle arises from the hard and narrow spirit displayed by Manning in the earlier period, and by those now who have the ear of cardinal Vaughan. Mr. de Lisle¹ who, for many years was a zealous fellow-worker with me in the cause of the Reunion Movement, was opposed both in Rome and in England by Archbishop Manning ; and the cause was thrown back for twenty years. We had a prolonged struggle, favoured in the first instance by the large-minded Cardinal Wiseman, but met at every turn by the hostility of his successor. Mr. de Lisle was a great friend of Mr. Gladstone, who took great interest in our work ; and I had many interviews with him in those days in Harley Street. You see I am no novice in the great work you have in hand, and naturally have a deep interest in your proceedings.

Mr. Gladstone's *Soliloquium*, with a covering letter from the Archbishop of York, was published in the end of May, and Mlle. Gavard,² who was as keenly alive as ever to all that touched the interests of religion, both in England and on the Continent, at once asked : ' Qu'est-ce que cette action de M. Gladstone ? J'en suis très émue. Cet homme aura eu toutes les grandeurs. Je parle de vous souvent avec le duc de Broglie et avec M. Thureau-Dangin.³ Celui-

¹ Ambrose de Lisle, of Grace Dieu Manor and Garrendon Park, Leicestershire, one of the founders of the Association for promoting the Unity of Christendom.

² Sister of M. Charles Gavard, formerly Secretary of Legation at the French Embassy in London. I had met various persons interested in reunion at her house in Paris. See p. 63.

³ Member of the Academy, author of the interesting work here alluded to on the Oxford Movement, *Le Catholicisme en Angleterre au xix^e siècle* (chez Bloud, 1910), being a summary of three previous volumes : *Sur la Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre* ; Part I., *Newman et le Mouvement d'Oxford* ; Part II., *De la Conversion de Newman à la mort de Wiseman* ; Part III., *De la Mort de Wiseman à la mort de Manning* (chez Plon, 1899-1906) ; followed by *Cardinal Vaughan* (chez Bloud, 1911).

ci médite tout un livre sur le mouvement dans l'Eglise anglicane. C'est bien le travail que voulait faire mon frère.'

MR. GLADSTONE'S 'SOLILOQUIUM'

The following paper, by Mr. Gladstone, under the title of a Soliloquium, was communicated by His Grace the Archbishop of York to the London newspapers, with a request for its publication : it appeared in the end of May 1896.

The question of the validity of Anglican Orders might seem to be of limited interest if it were only to be treated by the amount of any immediate, practical, and external consequences likely to follow upon any discussion or decision that might now be taken in respect to it. For the clergy of the Anglican communion, numbering between thirty thousand and forty thousand, and for their flocks, the whole subject is one of settled solidity. In the Oriental Churches there prevails a sentiment of increased and increasing friendliness towards the Anglican Church, but no question of actual intercommunion is likely at present to arise, while, happily, no system of proselytism exists to set a blister on our mutual relations. In the Latin Church, which from its magnitude and the close tissue of its organisation overshadows all Western Christendom, these Orders, so far as they have been noticed, have been commonly disputed, or denied, or treated as if they were null. A positive condemnation of them, if viewed dryly in its letter, would do no more than harden the existing usage of reordination in the case—which at most periods has been a rare one—of Anglican clergy who might seek admission to the clerical order in the Roman Church.

But very different indeed would be the moral aspect and effect of a formal, authorised investigation of the question at Rome, to whichever side the result might incline. It is to the last degree improbable that a ruler of known wisdom would at this time put in motion the machinery of the Curia for the purpose of widening the breach which severs the Roman Catholic Church from a communion which, though small in comparison, yet is extended through the large and fast-increasing range of the English-speaking races, and which represents, in the religious sphere, one of the most powerful nations of European Christendom. According to my reading of history, that breach is indeed

already a wide one, but the existing schism has not been put into stereotype by any anathema, or any express renunciation of communion, on either side. As an acknowledgment of Anglican Orders would not create intercommunion, so a condemnation of them would not absolutely excommunicate; but it would be a step, and even morally a stride, towards excommunication, and it would stand as a practical affirmation of the principle that it is wise to make religious differences between the Churches of Christendom more conspicuous to the world, and also to bring them into a state of the highest fixity, so as to enhance the difficulty of approaching them at any future time in the spirit of reconciliation. From such a point of view, an inquiry resulting in a proscription of Anglican orders would be no less important than deplorable.

But the information which I have been allowed, through the kindness of Lord Halifax, to share, altogether dispels from my mind every apprehension of this kind, and convinces me that if the investigations of the Curia did not lead to a favourable result, wisdom and charity would in any case arrest them at such a point as to prevent their becoming an occasion and a means of embittering religious controversy.

I turn, therefore, to the other alternative, and assume, for the sake of argument, that the judgment of the examining tribunal would be found either to allow upon all points the preponderance of the contentions on behalf of validity, or at the least to place beyond controversy a portion of the matters which enter into the essence of the discussion. I will for the present take it for granted that these fall under three heads:—

- (1) The external competency of the Consecrators.
- (2) The external sufficiency of the Commission they have conferred.
- (3) That sufficiency of intention which the Eleventh Canon of the Council of Trent appears to require.

Under the first head, the examination would, of course, include, in addition to the consecration of Parker, and the competency of his consecrators, the several cases in which consecrators outside the English line have participated in the consecrations of Anglican bishops, and have in this manner furnished independent grounds for the assertion of validity. Even the dismissal from the controversy of any one of these three heads would be in the nature of an advance toward concord, and would be so far a reward for the labours of his

Holiness, Pope Leo XIII., in furtherance of truth and peace. But I may be permitted to contemplate for a moment, as possible or likely, even the full acknowledgment that, without reference to any other real or supposed points of controversy, the simple abstract validity of Anglican consecrations is not subject to reasonable doubt.

And now I must take upon me to speak in the only capacity in which it can be warrantable for me to intervene in a discussion properly belonging to persons of competent authority. That is, the capacity of an absolutely private person, born and baptized in the Anglican Church, accepting his lot there, as is the duty of all who do not find that it has forfeited its original and inherent privilege and place. I may add that my case is that of one who has been led by the circumstances both of his private and of his public career, to a life-long and rather close observation of its character, its fortunes, and the part it has to play in the grand history of Redemption. Thus it is that its public interests are also his personal interests, and that they require or justify what is no more than his individual thought upon them.

He is not one of those who look for an early restitution of such a Christian unity as that which marked the earlier history of the Church. Yet he even cherishes the belief that work may be done in that direction, which, if not majestic or imposing, may nevertheless be legitimate and solid, and this by the least as well as by the greatest.

It is the Pope who, as the first Bishop of Christendom, has the noblest sphere of action ; but the humblest of the Christian flock has his place of daily duty, and, according as he fills it, helps to make or mar every good and holy work.

In this character the writer has viewed with profound and thankful satisfaction, during the last half century and more, the progressive advance of a great work of restoration in Christian doctrine. It has not been wholly confined within his own country to the Anglican communion, but it is best that he should speak of that which has been most under his eye. Within these limits, it has not been confined to doctrine, but has extended to Christian life and all its workings. The aggregate result has been that it has brought the Church of England from a state externally of halcyon calm, but inwardly of deep stagnation, to one in which, while buffeted more or less by external storms, subjected to some peculiar and searching forms of trial,

and even now by no means exempt from internal dissensions, it sees its clergy transformed (for this is the word which may advisedly be used), its vital energies enlarged and still growing in every direction, and a store of bright hopes accumulated that it may be able to contribute its share, and even possibly no mean share, towards the consummation of the work of the Gospel in the world.

Now, the contemplation of these changes by no means uniformly ministers to our pride. They involve large admissions of collective fault. This is not the place, and I am not the proper organ, for exposition in detail. But I may mention the widespread depression of evangelical doctrine, the insufficient exhibition of the Person and work of the Redeemer, the coldness and deadness as well as the infrequency of public worship, the relegation of the Holy Eucharist to impoverished ideas and to the place of one (though doubtless a solemn one) among its occasional incidents; the gradual effacement of Church observance from personal and daily life. In all these respects there has been a profound alteration, which is still progressive, and which, apart from occasional extravagance or indiscretion, has indicated a real advance in the discipline of souls, and in the work of God on behalf of man. A single-minded allegiance to truth sometimes exacts admissions which may be turned to account for the purpose of inflicting polemical disadvantage. Such an admission I must now record. It is not to be denied that a very large part of these improvements has lain in a direction which has diminished the breadth of separation between ourselves and the authorised teaching of the unreformed Church both in East and West, so that, while on the one hand they were improvements in religious doctrine and life, on the other hand they were testimonials recorded against ourselves and in favour of bodies outside our own precinct—that is to say, they were valuable contributions to the cause of Christian reunion.

With sorrow we noted that, so far as the Western Church was concerned, its only public and corporate movements, especially in 1870, seemed to meet the approximations made among us with something of recession from us. But it is not necessary to open further this portion of the subject: *redeunt Saturnia regna*. Certain publications of learned French priests, unsuspected in their orthodoxy, which went to affirm the validity of Anglican ordinations, naturally excited much interest in this country and elsewhere. But there was nothing in them to

ruffle the Roman atmosphere, or invest the subject, in the circles of the Vatican, with the character of administrative urgency.

When, therefore, it came to be understood that Pope Leo XIII. had given his commands that the validity of Anglican ordinations should form the subject of an historical and theological investigation, it was impossible not to be impressed with the profound interest of the considerations brought into view by such a step, if interpreted in accordance with just reason, as an effort towards the abatement of controversial differences.

There was indeed in my view a subject of thought, anterior to any scrutiny of the question upon its intrinsic merits, which deeply impressed itself upon my mind. Religious controversies do not, like bodily wounds, heal by the genial force of nature. If they do not proceed to gangrene and to mortification, at least they tend to harden into fixed facts, to incorporate themselves with law, character, and tradition, nay, even with language; so that at last they take rank among the *data* and presuppositions of common life, and are thought as inexpugnable as the rocks of an iron-bound coast. A poet of ours describes the sharp and total severance of two early friends :—

‘They parted, ne’er to meet again,
But never either found another
To free the hollow heart from paining.
They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
Like cliffs, which had been rent asunder,
A dreary sea now rolls between.’¹

Let us remember that we are now far advanced in the fourth century since the Convocation of Canterbury, under Warham in 1531, passed its canon or resolution on the Royal Governorship of the Church.

How much has happened during those centuries to inflame the strife, how little to abate or quench it ! What courage must it require in a Pope, what an elevation above all the levels of stormy partisanship, what genuineness of love for the whole Christian flock, whether separated or annexed, to enable him to approach the huge mass of hostile and still burning recollections in the spirit, and for the purposes of peace !

And yet, that is what Pope Leo XIII. has done, first in entertaining the question of this inquiry, and secondly, in determining and providing, by the infusion both of capacity and of im-

¹ Coleridge’s *Christabel*.

partiality into the investigating tribunal, that no instrument should be overlooked, no guarantee omitted for the probable attainment of the truth. He who bears in mind the cup of cold water administered to 'one of these little ones' will surely record this effort stamped in its very inception as alike arduous and blessed.

But what of the advantage to be derived from any proceeding which shall end, or shall reduce within narrower bounds, the debate upon Anglican Orders? I will put upon paper, with the utmost deference to authority and better judgment, my own personal and individual, and, as I freely admit, very insignificant reply to the question.

The one controversy which, according to my deep conviction, overshadows, and in the last resort absorbs all others is the controversy between faith and unbelief. It is easy to understand the reliance which the loyal Roman Catholic places upon the vast organisation and imposing belief and action of his Church as his provision for meeting the emergency. But I presume that even he must feel that the hundreds of millions who profess the name of Christ without owning the authority of his Church must count for something in the case, and that the more he is able to show their affirmative belief to stand in consonance with his, the more he strengthens both the common cause—for surely there is a common cause—and his own particular position.

If, out of every hundred professing Christians, ninety-nine assert amidst all their separate and clashing convictions their belief in the central doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, will not every member of each particular Church or community be forward to declare—will not the candid unbeliever be disposed freely to admit, that this unity amidst diversity is a great confirmation of the faith, and a broad basis on which to build our hopes of the future?

I now descend to a level which, if lower than that of these transcendent doctrines, is still a lofty level.

The historical transmission of the truth by a visible Church with an ordained constitution is a matter of profound importance according to the belief and practice of fully three-fourths of Christendom. In these three-fourths I include the Anglican Churches, which are probably required in order to make them up.

It is surely better for the Roman and also the Oriental Church to find the Churches of the Anglican succession standing side by

side with them in the assertion of what they deem an important Christian principle, than to be obliged to regard them as mere pretenders in this behalf, and *pro tanto* to reduce the 'cloud of witnesses' willing and desirous to testify on behalf of the principle. These considerations of advantage must of course be subordinated to historic truth, but for the moment advantage is the point with which I deal.

I attach no such value to these reflections as would warrant my tendering them for the consideration of any responsible person, much less of one laden with the cares and responsibilities of the highest position in the Christian Church.

On the other hand, there is nothing in them which requires that they should shrink from the light. They simply indicate the views of one who has passed a very long life in rather intimate connection with the Church of this country, with its rulers, its members, and its interests. I may add that my political life has brought me much into contact with those independent religious communities which supply an important religious factor in the religious life of Great Britain, and which, speaking generally, while they decline to own the authority either of the Roman or of the National Church, yet still allow to what they know as the established religion no inconsiderable hold upon their sympathies.

In conclusion, it is not for me to say what will be the upshot of the proceedings now in progress at Rome. But, be their issue what it may, there is, in my view, no room for doubt as to the attitude which has been taken by the actual Head of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to them. It seems to me an attitude in the largest sense paternal, and while it will probably stand among the latest recollections of my lifetime, it will ever be cherished with cordial sentiments of reverence, of gratitude, and of high appreciation.

To Father Puller, in a letter of the 2nd June, on the subject of what was being attempted to promote reunion, Mr. Gladstone expressed the opinion that:—

If you gain so much as a real, and not merely apparent, hairsbreadth in narrowing the controversy, if you remove any, the smallest, stumbling block, your labour will have been well laid out. Whether the Pope, as champion of unity, succeed or fail in this matter, any lover of unity owes him reverence and gratitude. I am also agreeably astonished as well as pleased

at the zeal and courage, as well as the ability, which have been shown by the Abbé Duchesne and Portal. There may be others, but these are the names which have been much before the world. The most learned friend¹ I have (since the death of Dr. Döllinger), tells me the Abbé Duchesne is the most learned man in France.

Writing to the Abbé Portal also, on the 2nd of June, I tell him that I have seen Cardinal Vaughan, adding : ' J'ai compris tout de suite (vous savez qu'il n'est pas du tout Italien), qu'il était mécontent, et qu'il tramait quelque chose,' but whether, if my impression was correct, this was due to the uncertainty whether the Pope had been persuaded or not to abandon his hope of doing anything in the interests of reunion, or to the fact reported on good authority that the Vatican was hesitating between two conflicting attitudes, and in doubt what course it should adopt, or was the result of Mr. Gladstone's *Soliloquium*, in regard to which the attitude of the *Tablet* was unmistakable, I did not know.

In a letter dated the 10th of June, Mr. Gladstone, to whom I had mentioned Cardinal Parocchi's conversation with the Abbé Portal described in the Abbé's letter of the 2nd June, after mentioning that he ' believed all the cardinals he had known were dead—de Luca, di Pietro, Reinach, Pentini '—and that he was ' still sceptical as to the importance of his *Soliloquium*, ' went on to say :—

The statement about the Bull of Pope Pius is at least interesting. I do not know whether the importance of that Bull has yet been adequately appreciated. Its effect on the condition of Recusants (as they were termed) was great, but it was greater on the Church of England. Queen Elizabeth, very wise in all Church matters, was evidently most reluctant to compromise any remaining hope of union. Consequently, looking upon the Thirty-nine Articles as the hoisting of an adverse flag (though they were to bind the clergy only) she repelled all attempts to give them statutory force, until after the Bull. When that had been issued, she then, in despair, gave way, and allowed to the Puritans, who, during the reign of Mary and the burnings had acquired the dominant position on the reforming side, such

¹ Sir John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, created Baron Acton 1869.

advantage as they could derive from them ; a fund which was not exhausted until after the deaths of Laud and Charles I.

But I am also anxious to write a word about the Cardinal Vicar's¹ very natural question as to getting behind the prejudices of the English people. Hereupon I would say two things :—

(1) It will be felt that in these matters great gentleness and patience are to be used. Some of the worst manifestations or expressions of the last sixty years have been due to rash utterances on the side of the Catholic movement, now happily not repeated.

(2) But further the change which has been effected within that time is immense, and that in two ways : (a) in the direct view taken of the Roman Church ; and this notwithstanding the Decrees under Pope Pius IX. ; (b) in the feeling of the country towards modification or development of thought or usage in the Roman or unreformed direction. I feel a sort of partial competency to give evidence on this subject, as a close and constant observer of the incidents of the movement from its beginning onwards. Perhaps I may not go too far in saying that on almost every occasion of my life I have been able to labour in a small way for the abatement of those prejudices, so that as you may know, I have been repeatedly shown up in the more violent Protestant papers as having been actually received into the Roman or (once) into the Oriental Church. This happy process, I am convinced, will with God's blessing, go on, unless we spoil it.

I have been much struck with the conduct of your friends, the French priests,² who seem really to have been prime movers in this business.

‘ When the hurly burly’s done,
When the battle’s lost and won,’

I should be glad if any kind of compliment or acknowledgment could be made to them, but in the quietest way, and nothing now.

The same day (10th June) the Bishop of Cairo, United States of America, wrote :—

What a blessed thing it is when Christian men try to learn

¹ See Lacey, *A Roman Diary*, pp. 73 and 78.

² The Abbé Portal and the Abbé Duchesne.

the real facts in regard to each other. Failure to understand is a most common cause of misunderstanding. You know how, when some one said to Charles Lamb, 'If you knew more about So-and-so, you would like him better.' 'I don't want to know him, I *want* to hate him,' was gentle Charles's reply! I am afraid it has often been the case in Church difficulties, that people have been afraid to find out exactly in regard to others, for fear that rivalries would be greatly diminished. If the question of Anglican Orders can be settled now, not according to prejudice, but on the firm basis of a knowledge of facts, a very great step will have been taken towards bringing all Catholic Christians into nearer relations. God bless you for your untiring labours in this direction, and in so many other good ways. 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

Father Puller and Mr. Lacey left Rome early in June. The former, after staying a day or two in Paris, arrived in London in company with the Abbé Duchesne about 15th June. The Abbé Duchesne, after receiving a degree at Cambridge, spent Sunday, 21st June, at Salisbury with the bishop, and had, whilst staying in London, the opportunity of seeing the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Gloucester and Bristol, Peterborough, Lincoln and Ely. He also went to see Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden before returning to Paris.

The Abbé Portal, writing from Paris the day Father Puller and the Abbé Duchesne went to London, says :—

J'arrive de la Gare du Nord, où j'ai accompagné le cher père Puller. J'y ai rencontré l'abbé Duchesne. Celui-ci a vu avant son départ le cardinal Rampolla et le cardinal Seraphino Vannutelli. Aux deux il a dit des vérités très fortes. Le second est impressionné par l'attitude unanime des catholiques anglais. Aux deux l'abbé Duchesne a dit qu'il s'agissait maintenant de montrer qu'on avait une bonne volonté réelle. Les bonnes paroles dans de belles encycliques ne suffisent pas. Il a expliqué l'état d'esprit des catholiques anglais, en ajoutant que tous ne partageaient pas les idées du cardinal Vaughan. Le cher père Puller a été reçu chez nous ¹ avec la plus grande cordialité. Il

¹ The Lazarist house in Paris.

vous racontera tout cela. Je ne saurais vous dire à quel point ces deux messieurs ont fait du bien.

Writing myself to the Abbé on the 25th of June, in regard to the Abbé Duchesne's visit, I tell him :—

J'ai dit adieu à l'abbé Duchesne hier. La réception à Cambridge a été magnifique. L'orateur public a insisté sur ce que faisait l'abbé pour l'union. Samedi l'abbé est allé chez l'évêque de Salisbury. L'évêque a invité le clergé de la ville à l'Evêché, et a prié l'abbé de leur faire un petit discours, ce que l'abbé a fait de la plus aimable façon. Lundi, l'abbé est arrivé chez nous. Mardi l'archevêque d'York, l'évêque de Londres, et l'évêque d'Ely ont diné ici. Mercredi matin l'archevêque d'York, l'évêque de Peterborough et l'évêque de Gloucester ont déjeuné chez nous. On a beaucoup causé, et l'abbé a très bien parlé, à propos des Russes, sur des points historiques—que les grands sièges épiscopaux étaient les points de départ, les centres d'où rayonnaient, pour ainsi dire, les évêchés voisins. Je crois qu'on a bien compris, et qu'on reconnaissait que l'abbé avait raison.

Après le déjeuner j'ai conduit l'abbé à Windsor. Je lui ai fait visiter la chapelle de St. George ; il a assisté à un petit bout de l'office (on chantait les Vêpres), et ensuite nous avons parcouru la Bibliothèque royale. On lui a montré les miniatures de Marie Stuart, les portraits de Vandyck, etc., etc., la journée était magnifique, et le parc et le château se montraient au mieux.

In a letter which crossed mine, the Abbé Portal told me that the Encyclical, which it was known the Pope was about to issue would appear at once, adding : ' D'après ce que me disait l'abbé Boudinhon, comme le tenant de Mgr. Gasparri, il y aura bien du bon sur l'*unitas*, et sur l'*unicitas*. Le Pape insisterait sur cette distinction, paraît-il, d'une manière très neuve.'

CHAPTER XIII

THE ENCYCLICAL *Satis Cognitum*—THE ABBÉ PORTAL'S ADDRESS
DELIVERED IN LONDON THE 14TH OF JULY—LETTERS TO CARDINAL
PAROCCHI AND CARDINAL RAMPOLLA.

THE Pope's letter, known from its opening words as the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, was published in England on the 30th June. Published as it was only in part, with a comment prefixed to it by the Cardinal, a comment emphasized by an article in the *Times*, it was a foregone conclusion in what light the Encyclical, not only in regard to itself, but in regard to its object, would be regarded, and what effect it would necessarily have on English opinion. If the Cardinal had desired to defeat what had been the Pope's hopes and intentions in regard to reunion, he could hardly have set about it in any other way. It was the same policy, and supported by the same means, as that which had been adopted the preceding year with reference to the letter *Ad Anglos*. It made such comments on the Encyclical as might have been made with advantage impossible, and excited others calculated not only to undo all that was in progress towards bringing about a better understanding between England and Rome, but certain to serve the purpose of those whose object it was to represent the Church of England in such a light to the Roman authorities as would convince them of the fruitlessness of all attempts at corporate reunion.

A wider view of the dangers resulting from the divisions of Christendom, a larger and more adequate grasp of history, and a desire to make the best instead of the worst of the Church of England, might have suggested a different line of conduct, for the Encyclical itself was capable of being

brought before the public under a very different aspect from that in which it was represented. In the first place it based the claims of the Papacy, not on any theory of development such as that asserted by Cardinal Newman in his celebrated *Essay*, but on the teaching of our Lord as witnessed to and interpreted by the Primitive Church, and, as an illustration of such teaching, it appealed to the relations of St. Cyprian and St. Stephen with the Holy See. On such a basis, although there might be dispute as to facts, there was nothing in principle inconsistent with what the English Church could accept. There was, on the contrary, everything to make friendly conferences on the subject possible.¹

In the second place, while the Encyclical claimed for the Papacy all that had been given by our Lord to St. Peter, it claimed also for the Episcopate all that had been given by our Lord to the Apostles. It cut at the roots of the theory that the members of the Episcopate have no direct authority derived from Christ; and by implication, if it asserted for the Pope all the authority given to St. Peter, by its assertion for the Episcopate of all the authority given to the Apostles, it might be thought to claim on behalf of the Episcopate—an assertion strengthened by the reference to St. Cyprian—a right of resistance in regard to the successors of St. Peter, such as that exercised by St. Paul in respect to St. Peter himself. Further, it drew a distinction between the *unitas* of the Church and its *unicitas*, which involved consequences of the greatest importance in regard to all that concerns corporate reunion, and the basis on which such reunion could be attempted.

Those, however, who were responsible for the publication

¹ See letter of Archbishop of York to the Abbé Portal, dated 27th March 1896 (p. 280). "In respect to our relations with the Church of Rome, while it is absolutely vain to expect that England would ever accept the idea of the Papacy as we have been accustomed to have it presented to us, we could never hesitate to admit whatever can be shown to be in accordance with the Will of our Blessed Lord and the teaching of the Primitive Church. It is in this spirit that we should welcome any opportunities of "friendly conference" which might tend to bring about a better understanding between us on the basis of St. Augustine's rule: "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas."

of the Encyclical had no desire to smooth matters as between England and Rome. They were only concerned in getting English Orders condemned, and for this purpose they insisted upon a view of the English Church which could not fail to prejudice any decision given on the subject, and could only serve to aggravate existing divisions.

The summary of the Encyclical *Cognitum* supplied to the *Times* by Cardinal Vaughan was prefaced by a letter from the Cardinal himself. In that letter after announcing the Encyclical to be 'an authoritative statement as to the basis on which reunion, whether of individuals or of corporate bodies, with the Catholic Church is possible,' and referring to 'those who had been under the strange delusion that it was in the power of the Holy Father to modify or dispense with the ancient terms of communion'¹ in order to bring about so blessed and desirable an end as the reunion of Christendom,' the Cardinal said, 'the Encyclical will no doubt dispel vague and hazy theories which are rich only in delusive hopes, while by God's grace it will make clear the path to all who believe they ought to walk in it.'

The letter was followed by the summary of the Encyclical itself. After a description of the Church, the summary went on to say: 'The Church rests on St. Peter as a building on its foundation.' The power of 'commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called jurisdiction, was conveyed to St. Peter,' and was to be 'inherited by St. Peter's successors.' 'That power is supreme and absolutely independent, embracing the whole Church and all things committed to the Church.' Though 'other Bishops are not to be regarded as mere vicars of the Roman Pontiff, since they exercise a power which is really their own, they are deprived of the right of ruling if they secede from Peter and his successors, who have received sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.' Not only is 'each Bishop bound to obey the authority of the Roman Pontiff, but the Bishops taken collectively are also bound in the same way.' . . . 'He who is set over

¹ A complete misstatement of the fact.

the flock must have authority not only over the sheep when they are dispersed, but when they are gathered together.' 'The Vatican Council had only declared what had always been the faith of the Church.'

Much that was to be found in the actual text of the Encyclical was omitted, and the impression conveyed by the summary was certainly not that conveyed by the Encyclical as a whole. That impression was further emphasized by the article in the *Times* drawing attention to the Encyclical. 'The Encyclical,' the article declared, 'was dignified, temperate and charitable, but even more than the former letter, *Ad Anglos*, it made it clear that in no single particular either of doctrine or of discipline will the claims of the Papal See be relaxed to meet the aspirations for what is known as reunion among a section of those bred up in the faith of the Church of England.' It was to be observed that the Encyclical did 'not deal directly with the question of the validity of Anglican Orders,' which was 'still the subject of inquiry,' but it deprived that controversy of any serious importance. The Pope's language, as Cardinal Vaughan said, would 'dispel vague and hazy theories which are rich only in delusive hopes.' 'We acquiesce in this opinion,' the article continued, 'all the more because the original letter addressed to the English people did not, in our judgment, allow any encouragement to Lord Halifax and his fellow-dreamers. As was pointed out at the time in these columns, there was not a word from beginning to end which justified the assumption that Rome would, or could, treat the question of reunion as a matter of negotiation.' The Pope now, in what 'Cardinal Vaughan calls an authoritative statement,' leaves those who persist in misinterpreting his original letter no shadow of an excuse for their delusion.¹ 'The terms on which alone

¹ A statement anticipating the opinion expressed later by Mr. Snead-Cox, the editor of the *Tablet* and the author of Cardinal Vaughan's *Life*. Cf. 'But though Lord Halifax considered the Pope's reference to the Rosary and Indulgences deplorably injudicious, his incurable hopefulness quickly reasserted itself . . . he was still confident that the validity of Anglican Orders would yet be established.'—*Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 186.

reunion is possible are a complete and unhesitating acceptance not only of the Primacy, but of the paramount and absolute predominance of the Roman Pontiff over all professing to belong to the Christian Church, the entire submission of the heart and mind, the intelligence and conscience of Christendom to the decrees of the Papal See : reunion can only be effected by the admission to the full of these claims.' . . . 'The pretence can no longer be maintained that reconciliation with Rome does not involve renunciation of the Church of England. When it is understood that " reunion " means submission to Rome pure and simple, it will not be necessary to discuss it any further.' It would have been impossible to state more clearly all that Cardinal Vaughan wished to have said, or to have expressed more accurately the principles that had governed his whole conduct. In a letter to the Abbé Portal, dated the 30th of June, I say :—

Le cardinal, il me semble, a publié de l'Encyclique précisément les extraits propres à entraver les désirs du Pape.

Evidemment personne, je parle du public, ne lira autre chose que ce qui a été publié dans le *Times*. Si on avait publié l'Encyclique en entier l'effet aurait été différent, mais avec ce qu'on a donné, la partie me semble perdue, au moins pour le moment. Puller vient ici demain, et j'ai télégraphié à Lacey pour le prier de venir aussi.

Voici quelques coupures de journaux. C'est vrai qu'on a vu seulement les extraits de l'Encyclique que le cardinal a bien voulu envoyer aux journaux, mais l'effet est produit, et rien ne pourra empêcher la déplorable impression qui a été produite. Le cardinal a certainement réussi dans son coup, et le Pape l'a bien aidé. Enfin, mon cher ami, pour le moment c'est fini ici, et il n'y a plus rien à faire. C'est la politique du cardinal qui a prévalu, et au lieu de finir avec la question du Pape et de Rome comme nous le désirions, on a voulu aussi à Rome commencer par là.

C'est triste de voir tout détruit quand nous espérions que tout allait si bien ; mais il faut baisser la tête et se taire ; pour moi, j'ai la bouche fermée. Ce qui reste, c'est notre amitié et tout ce que je ressens et tout ce que je ressentirai à tout jamais pour vous.

The same day the Abbé Portal who, like myself, had not seen a complete copy of the Encyclical, wrote :—

Je suis convaincu que nous sommes en face d'un Traité de l'Eglise. Dans ce traité il doit y avoir deux parties, le Pape et les évêques. Nous restons dans le statu quo ante. Le concile du Vatican reste ce qu'il était, notre principale difficulté. L'essentiel serait que de votre côté on ne s'emportât pas. Tout ce que vous avez dit au sujet du Pape vous met à l'aise. Il faut vous mettre sur le même terrain. Les conférences sont nécessaires. Je suis convaincu qu'il y aura un acte en notre faveur, ou bien alors il faudrait désespérer de tout !

On the following day (1st July) he wrote again :—

Je ne suis pas rentré dans ma chambre depuis ce matin, et je ne trouve que maintenant votre mot d'hier. Ne vous découragez pas, non seulement à cause de la beauté de l'œuvre mais aussi parce qu'il faut savoir si, oui ou non, Rome veut aller de l'avant. Il est essentiel que vous ne donniez pas prétexte à un recul.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE,
1 juillet 1896.

Ce qui fait le mal n'est pas l'Encyclique en elle-même, quoique je trouve la question des droits du Pape tout à fait inopportune en ce moment, c'est la manière dont elle a été présentée au public, et commentée par le cardinal, et c'est un malheur presque irréparable. Personne ne lira l'Encyclique en entier (je parle du public) et, après ce que la Presse en a dit, tout le monde est convaincu que le Pape partage la manière de voir du cardinal. Les extraits de journaux que je vous ai envoyés le démontrent de la manière la plus claire.

Il faut avouer que le Saint-Père est fort mal servi par les siens ici. Le cardinal et son monde sont impossibles. Lacey¹ est

¹ Mr. Lacey had written : 'The Encyclical is all that I expected, and more. The part I was not anticipating, which is of first-rate importance, is that about the *magisterium*. The Pope appears to place this not in the Papacy, or in the Roman Church, but in the Collective Episcopate. The emphatic and final repudiation of the idea that the bishops are in any sense vicars of the Pope is of almost equal importance.

The letter—as I was led to expect by Gasparri—gives the *coup-de-grâce* to the theory that the *One Church* means those Christians who are actually

assez content de l'Encyclique prise en elle-même. Puller a vu ce matin l'archevêque de Canterbury, qui n'était pas dans de mauvaises dispositions ; il a compris d'après ce que Puller m'a dit, qu'il y avait des choses importantes dans l'Encyclique. Je crois que c'est très important de distinguer entre l'Encyclique en elle-même, et le sens qu'on s'efforce de lui donner, mais plus j'y réfléchis, plus il me semble qu'il n'y a rien à faire au moins pour le moment. Il y aurait eu des difficultés, même si d'abord on avait lu l'Encyclique en entier, mais présentée au public et commentée comme elle l'a été par la lettre du cardinal, elle a produit un effet que rien ne peut atténuer, et qui me ferme la bouche. Le but de tout ce que nous faisons dans l'intérêt de la réunion, était d'amener les esprits, chez nous, à envisager la possibilité de s'entendre avec Rome au sujet des droits du Pape. Cela demandait des soins et des ménagements infinis. Nous avons fait du chemin, et maintenant tout est compromis par l'action du cardinal, et par la portée qu'on veut donner à l'Encyclique. Vous voyez comme le cardinal a su rattacher à la lettre *Ad Anglos* ce que le Pape vient de dire maintenant, et comme il a fait comprendre à tout le monde que nous étions battus : on ne m'écouterait pas si je tâchais d'amoindrir l'impression produite. Après tout, le cardinal est dans son droit, et si à Rome on le laisse agir, c'est qu'on ne veut pas autre chose.

Ce qui sauverait la situation serait une démarche quelconque de la part du Pape, qui donnerait le démenti à ce que le cardinal a voulu insinuer, et à ce que la presse, avec laquelle il a beaucoup de relations, s'est plu à répéter et à amplifier à sa façon.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, juillet 1896.

Je suis de plus en plus convaincu que l'Encyclique n'aura pas, par elle-même, les tristes conséquences que vous prévoyez. Pour

in communion with the Holy See. The One Church is wider, and the Pope's contention is that communion with the Holy See is the appointed means for holding the members of this One Church in a further degree of unity than could otherwise be obtained. Lack of this communion, he says, interferes, not with the effective, but with the legitimate exercise of the powers of the Episcopate, which is precisely Boudinhon's contention, and one which can fairly be met in friendly argument.' For the Abbé Boudinhon's opinion, see *Rerum Anglo-Romaine*, vol. i. pp. 348-357, and vol. ii. pp. 97-107 ; and compare these articles with the account of the Catholic Congress at Velehrad, in Moravia, and the speech of the Jesuit, Father John Urban, July 1907, p. 400.

conjuré les effets produits par la manière dont elle a été présentée à votre public voici ce que je vous propose. Réunissez un meeting ; j'y viendrai, et j'y parlerai. Ce que je dirai pourra être publié sur les toits, mais les circonstances donneront à mes paroles un caractère qui en fera toute l'importance. Un mot là-dessus. Si vous l'acceptez, j'arriverai pour le meeting et je repartirai tout de suite après.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, juillet 1896.

Il m'est impossible de vous répondre au sujet de la démarche dont vous parlez, sans consulter quelques-uns de nos amis. De plus, il faudrait deux ou trois jours pour arranger la chose, si on la croit possible.

Je vous ai écrit à Paris hier. Voici une lettre d'un de mes amis, un prêtre excellent, tout à fait dans nos idées, et vous pouvez juger, d'après ce qu'il dit, à quel point le cardinal a réussi à faire comprendre à tout le monde que tout est fini. C'est presque impossible de détruire une telle impression.

Il est possible que nous puissions arranger une réunion de soixante à soixante-dix prêtres à qui on pourrait expliquer la situation, et qu'après, on puisse publier quelque chose, tel qu'un discours de vous, qui ferait du bien, mais je ne suis pas sûr que pour le moment le plus sage ne soit pas de rester tranquille. Si le Pape savait ! mais il ne sait pas, et il y a trop de personnes intéressées à lui boucher les oreilles pour qu'il apprenne comment il faut s'y prendre, si on veut renouer les anciennes relations qui unissaient l'Angleterre à Rome.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, juillet 1896.

Je vais partir pour Calais : j'ai à faire dans le Nord.¹ J'y attendrai de vos nouvelles. Si vous voulez que nous nous voyions j'irai à Douvres où nous pourrions passer quelques heures ensemble. J'aimerais bien vous voir, mon pauvre ami, j'en aurais besoin ;

¹ The Abbé had suggested by telegraph that it might be useful if we met.

car, si vous souffrez, vous devez comprendre pour quel motif particulier je souffre, moi aussi, atrocement. Nos journaux annoncent une lettre de l'archevêque d'York ; que contient-elle ? Ma souffrance d'aujourd'hui est la continuation d'une souffrance intime, pénétrante jusqu'à la moelle, que j'ai endurée à Rome pendant deux mois et demi.

Si nous ne devons pas nous voir ces jours-ci, nous nous retrouverons au Mont-Dore. L'auditeur de la nonciature paraissait assez étonné de l'Encyclique. Il ne s'est pas mépris sur l'effet qu'elle allait produire. Je ne me suis nullement gêné pour lui dire que d'après l'appréciation de tous les laïques, c'était un recul dans la politique du Saint-Père. Il m'a demandé qui l'avait composée. Je lui ai dit que, selon moi, c'était le cardinal Mazzella. Il a fait un rapprochement avec le traducteur français, un père Jésuite de Paris, qui avait été mandé à Rome exprès. L'auditeur m'a confirmé l'opinion que je vous avais déjà rapportée au sujet de l'origine première de l'Encyclique. 'C'est une réponse autorisée aux Grecs,' m'a-t-il dit. Quel enfantillage !

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE,

8 juillet 1896.

Je crains beaucoup qu'il me soit impossible de venir à Douvres. Je médite la réunion d'une cinquantaine de membres du clergé de Londres où vous pourriez parler. Ce serait au moins une raison de nous voir, mais je vous enverrai une dépêche ce soir.

Je viens de voir quelques-uns de nos amis. Il serait impossible d'arranger une conférence avant la semaine prochaine, seulement je me demande si cela vaut vraiment la peine. Que pourriez-vous dire qui serait à la fois utile et qui ne vous compromettrait pas ? Ce que je reproche au cardinal c'est qu'il a fait tout son possible pour provoquer les procédés dont il se servira à Rome pour appuyer ses idées. Enfin si vous le croyez utile, venez me voir, ou si vous croyez que cela vaut la peine venez la semaine prochaine ; vous feriez alors un discours à un auditoire que je vous aurais préparé et nous publierions un compte rendu de ce qui aurait été dit.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

EATON SQUARE,
juillet 1896.

C'est très bien, et je vous attends lundi.¹ Notre réunion est convoquée pour mardi, 14, à 3 heures.

Voulez-vous que je traduise votre discours, parlant, pour ainsi dire, en même temps que vous ? C'est malheureux que tant de personnes ici comprennent si mal le français.

Je vais m'occuper de la presse et des reporters, et nous déterminerons lundi soir la façon dont votre discours doit être publié.

The Abbé Portal, accompanied by M. Tavernier, of the *Univers*, arrived in London on Monday, 13th July ; and on the 14th he delivered a speech, the following report of which is taken from the *Guardian* :—

In view of the misconceptions to which expression has been so largely given in the press, a certain number of clergy and others met yesterday week, at the invitation of Lord Halifax, for the purpose of discussing the real bearing of the recent Encyclical on the movement for the restoration of the visible unity of the Church. The meeting was largely attended by influential persons from all parts of England. Previous to the formal opening of the meeting, the Abbé Portal, who was staying with Lord Halifax, addressed those present, and gave them his view of the matter they were about to discuss. The Abbé's eloquent address, which was delivered in French,² was listened to with profound attention and interest.

The Abbé said : ' He who stands before you is a French priest, and a humble son of St. Vincent de Paul. You are prepared to give him your welcome and sympathy, not because you expect him to identify himself entirely with you in all your sentiments, or to speak to you altogether in the same terms as one of your own communion, but because you know that like you, and with you, he earnestly desires to further the great work of the union

¹ The Abbé had telegraphed to say that he was arriving, and that M. Tavernier, one of the editors of the *Univers*, was coming with him. M. Tavernier was the nephew and representative on the *Univers* of M. Eugène Veuillot, the brother of M. Louis Veuillot, the journalist so well known as the determined opponent of the ideas represented by M. de Montalembert and Mgr. Dupanloup, the Bishop of Orléans.

² It was translated by Father Puller and myself.

of the hearts of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in one visible Church. Yes, I am a humble disciple of St. Vincent de Paul, whose name soars in a region above all human strife and all human divisions, that great apostle of charity both human and divine, who in modern times has done so much to heal so many sorrows and to soothe so many pains, and I like to hope that his children, animated by that same spirit of single-mindedness, humility, and love which it was his object to inculcate among his followers, may, by God's blessing, be instrumental in healing the wounds by which the Church, the suffering Bride of Christ, is afflicted. And I am also a priest of the Church of France—that Church so close to your shores which, as Cardinal Vaughan in a letter addressed to a French priest has lately reminded you, has in past days rendered some not unimportant services to your own Church—that Church of England which you love so well. And I am also a priest of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church, which is so dear to her own sons, and I am bound to that Church by all the cords of my inmost being, in regard to which you need no assurances from me that I would rather die than not believe as she believes, and not reject what she condemns. In particular I believe in the divine prerogatives of the Holy See and the successors of St. Peter. Nor could you yourselves for a moment doubt my belief, since were it otherwise I should be unworthy to be associated with you in that noble struggle which above all things demands the most perfect loyalty and truth, the struggle to win back for Christendom the reunion in one visible Church of all its members. It is now hardly more than a month ago since I had the happiness to say Mass at the tomb of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul. Seven Sisters of Charity were also present, and close to them knelt two whom you know well—Father Puller and Mr. Lacey. I said Mass for the intention of the work of reunion. We all prayed for God's blessing on that great work, which, like all else that is really great in the sight of God, will be the result of those virtues of love and self-sacrifice so well symbolised by the religious habit of the daughters of St. Vincent of Paul. May it please God to realise the hope that the day may not be far distant when those dear friends who, to our and their great regret, are now unable to communicate with us at the same altar, may be enabled to be again completely one with us where they would most desire it. But if we are unhappily divided in certain ways, we are completely at one in a common resolution. We desire, with that energetic resolution which is stopped by

no obstacle, we desire, I say, to bring our unhappy divisions to an end. Gentlemen, the reunion of Christendom is so beautiful a thing, that from the very beginning of our campaign we have been accused of seeking a Utopia which can never exist. This reproach has been addressed to greater people than ourselves. When I had the honour of speaking for the first time to his Holiness about the reunion of the Churches, Leo XIII. said to me : " People have come to me in this very room where we are, and have told me that this reunion at which I am aiming is a Utopia." We are then in good company, the company of the Pope himself. Further, we are told that we are not only Utopian in our aims, but are also under a complete illusion as to the means by which those aims are to be accomplished, and that we do not see the obstacles which stand in our way. The fact is that those who speak in this way are themselves completely mistaken.

' When Leo XIII. did me the great honour of admitting me to an audience, he asked me what, in my opinion, were the obstacles to reunion. I replied : " Holy father, strictly speaking, there are but two obstacles—one, an obstacle having to do with doctrine, the other one relating to practice. The doctrinal obstacle concerns yourself, Holy Father." This I said smiling. " The practical obstacles are—" But, gentlemen, it is, perhaps, better not to name them here. Human passion, human feelings, and human rivalries are facts which cannot be ignored, and as to other difficulties which stand in the way they were foreseen, and those who are opposed to us know that we are doing our best to surmount them. Neither let them impute to us aims absurd in themselves, and which have never been ours. We have never desired a federal union of separate Churches. Neither have we desired merely an invisible union. We seek for the real, complete and visible union which our Lord willed for His Church ; we desire to promote the reunion of Christendom on the basis of one united Church, with its hierarchy, its government, and its faith. In reality these objections all proceed from one source. Those who make them do not believe that corporate reunion is a practical possibility. This is the exact point of divergence. The only solution of the question is in their view by means of individual conversion. I need not enter into the question why this view is adopted, but I can confidently retort upon its holders the imputation of entertaining illusions and aiming at Utopias. If people will face the facts, every one must surely see that England can never be brought back into

Christian unity merely by individual conversions. No doubt the number of Catholics in England has largely increased, but to what is that increase chiefly due ? To the Irish immigration. Moreover, the individual conversions which have already taken place have not produced the results which were expected from them. The conversion of Cardinal Newman and others, although it has deprived the Church of England of some of her most illustrious children, has not permanently weakened the Church of England. The progress of the great religious revival within the Church of England is stronger than ever. In presence, then, of the Church of England, intimately connected as it is with the national life on its political, its intellectual and its social side, our position as Roman Catholics stands thus. The forces of the Catholic Church in England consist chiefly of Irishmen—a considerable majority of the clergy are Irish themselves. Is it probable, if we are to limit ourselves to individual conversions, that England will be won back by such influences ? No one can doubt the sympathies which have always existed between France and Ireland, and which assuredly are felt most deeply by me ; but here you are in presence of a question of race which really presents an insuperable obstacle to your desires. Further, the English Catholics themselves are not uninfluenced by certain tendencies, the result of their isolation and of their persecutions in times past—tendencies which hinder sympathetic relations with the National Church, and so deprive them of that influence on its members which they might otherwise possess. On the other hand, the English Church seems to be growing stronger every day. Her members find in her services and sacraments and in the revival of the religious life the satisfaction of their spiritual wants ; the conclusion of all which is that the method of individual conversions is not likely to produce any great effect on the mass of the population. For these reasons, and without forming any judgment as to the duties which might be binding upon individuals, corporate reunion would seem to be the method which ought to be preferred when we are considering the action of one Church upon another. And this not only because it is the only method likely to lead to any large practical results, but also because it is most in harmony with our principles. Our fundamental principle is the principle of authority ; moreover, this method of corporate reunion is more in conformity with the principle of authority, because it saves the individual from the torture

of doubt, and other risks incurred by a personal investigation of the faith. You say to a soul which by its past, its education, and the graces it has received is bound by all the cords of its being to this or that Church—you say to such a soul, You are in error, and outside the true fold. Who does not see the suffering and doubt which is thus produced ? It is not, however, the suffering on which I wish to dwell. Who does not see the danger of such a shaking of the whole roots of the spiritual life ? We hear much of conversions ; but we are not told so much of those converts who have gone back to their original faith, or who have lost their faith altogether. One might name instances of men who were first Anglicans, then Catholics, and have finally ended in the most absolute scepticism. Such cases are the consequences of a method of proceeding which may be necessary, but which is often dangerous in itself. And this is the only method which in the opinion of some people is to be adopted for the restoration of unity. All souls are to be subjected to this torment of doubt and deadly disquietude. They have to ask themselves whether the graces they have received are real graces, or the illusions of the devil—whether the Holy Ghost has been acting on the soul, or whether the soul has merely been the plaything of its own imagination. And if it must be owned that these distresses have been the necessary lot of Anglicans in the nineteenth century, at least, if it be possible, let the Anglicans of the future be spared such torments. I plead again that it may not be deliberately insisted upon if another course is possible, and that members of the English Church may be spared all this anguish by the adoption of that other and better method, the method of corporate reunion. But is such union possible ? According to those who oppose our efforts it is not, and is merely put forward as a lure to prevent individual conversions ; but, gentlemen, that is not my opinion. Corporate reunion is possible because it is necessary. Consider the present state of the Christian world. You are confronted by three great religious centres—Russia, England, and Rome. In Russia you are in the presence of a people which has remained more profoundly Christian than perhaps any other people in Europe. The power of Russia is increasing, not only by its conquest in the East, but by the spread of its influence in the West. What England is, you yourselves know well. I need not remind you what power and vitality marks its religion, or how great is the political influence which it exercises on the Continent, in India.

and throughout its colonies. Rome, on the other hand, as in other things, so conspicuously in this, appeals to the minds of men by her wonderful organisation and by her spirit of government; but Rome has lost the people of the North; she suffers from the loss of the Teutonic element, while among the Latin races, and even in France, which is more and more abandoning her traditional position of the defender of Catholic interests outside her own border, and chiefly in the East, the clergy, in spite of their apostolic zeal, their virtue, and their learning, in no way exercise the influence they ought to have on the affairs of the country. England and Russia then are centres of religious influence of the greatest importance, and if, as thoughtful observers are beginning to think is not improbable, the Churches of England and Russia should be brought into a closer relationship than exists at present, it is impossible not to see that such a union cannot be without its effect on the Catholic Church and the Latin races. Union is necessary for us, if in view of the contingencies of such a future combination we are not to find our own action hampered. And union is also necessary for you. Have you nothing to gain in the greater strength such union would give in your relations with the State, and in regard to your discipline? Do you not feel the need of having a centre and a head? Have we nothing to gain by union with you, by being brought into closer contact with your political and intellectual life? Our Lord has, indeed, promised that He will be with His Church to the end, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, but He has not promised her prosperity, and her prosperity or the reverse depends on the exertions of her members. If we are united we are strong, if divided we are weak—weak and incapable of resisting the enemies of religion and society. Union, therefore, is possible, because it is necessary; let us unite, then; let us insist that union shall take place for the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. And, gentlemen, I say again, such union is possible, and without compromise of principle. It is possible—nay, it is easy, in regard to all sacramental doctrine; for, as Dr. Pusey insisted, there are no irreconcilable differences between your formularies and the teaching of the Council of Trent. There remains the serious obstacle of the decrees of the Vatican Council; but, gentlemen, allow me to say neither is that an obstacle which is insurmountable. I will not, on an occasion like the present, enter into elaborate discussion; but I do say, apart from theology, when such men

as the Abbé Duchesne and Father Puller think an understanding—an understanding, mark the word, not a *compromise*—might be arrived at, then such an understanding is and must be possible. Nor, gentlemen, is the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* any fresh obstacle either. To say that it is meant to give a back-handed death-blow to the hopes of those who are endeavouring to promote corporate reunion is to attribute to Leo XIII. something that is not worthy of him. I say that it is no obstacle if it is studied with calmness and patience.

‘The Encyclical lays down the oneness of the Church, and the means appointed by our Lord for preserving the Church in unity. It shows how the government of the Church depends on an Episcopate and a head, a constitution which enables the Church, always in subordination to the inherent rights of both powers, to centralise or decentralise her forces according to the needs of the times. After stating the prerogatives of Rome, the Pope points out that these are nothing new, not the result of a certain theory of development which would be inadmissible, but what was entrusted by our Lord to St. Peter and to His Apostles. The teaching of the Church to-day is not different from the teaching of the primitive Church from the beginning. The prerogatives of the Pope are of Divine Right. Holy Scripture and the consensus of the Early Fathers attest it. Surely the Anglican Church cannot refuse this meeting-point to which Leo XIII. invites her? The Encyclical is very beautiful. It gives us the impression we experience when we penetrate into the essence of things. I repeat again—the constitution of the Church, as Leo XIII. points out, is to be found in the powers of the Pope and of the Episcopate, and the rights of both have to be preserved. The constitution is Divine; but there is also the human element. It is Divine power, but Divine power entrusted to men. Hence it is that scandals have arisen, and do arise; but we confess our faults, and in confessing our faults we find the road to unity. Gentlemen, in conclusion, let me end by words of confidence. Those who oppose us, who declare that the idea of corporate reunion is an ideal dream, imagine that we shall be discouraged by their opposition. They are much mistaken. We know indeed that there are obstacles, obstacles many and great, but we did not begin the work because we believed it to be easy of accomplishment, but because we believed it to be God’s will; and we shall continue to strive on its behalf for the same, and for no other reason. Who would

have thought two years ago that we should have seen the results which are already apparent? In France, two years ago, we hardly knew you. Lutherans, Calvinists, Protestants of every description, and members of the Church of England, all were thought to be the same, and no distinction was made between them. It is not so now. In every part of France this question of reunion with you excites the keenest interest. You know what you are, and have been doing on your side on behalf of the same cause. To me, personally, it has been a source of the keenest and deepest interest to see what I have seen with my own eyes. That Mr. Gladstone should have spoken as he has is a fact of the greatest importance, and destined to bear much fruit. There is no one who has not been profoundly moved by the greatness of the ideas expressed by Mr. Gladstone and the touching humility, in all that regards himself, of him who says them. I would say to you all, Have confidence in Leo XIII. Despite all that has been said, despite all that has been done to hinder the accomplishment of his wishes, Leo XIII. loves England. He said to me himself—and I may surely repeat it to you: "Ah, if I could only see the beginning of what might lead to the reunion of the Church of England with the Catholic Church, with what joy should I sing my *Nunc dimittis*—England in union with Rome would mean the conquest of the world to the faith of Christ." "England," as a cardinal said to me, "has powerful friends at Rome." When hearts are united the union of heads is not far distant. For the success of all works which relate to God sacrifice is necessary. Who would not be ready to sacrifice himself, to give his life, if need be, to promote the great work of reunion? But God does not ask our life. He is content with less. He asks only our self-devotion. Let us give Him our hearts, our wills, all the powers of our being to further this great work of reunion in the full confidence that He Who has inspired us to begin the work, will, in His own good time and His own good way, enable, if not us, those who come after us, to bring it to its perfect and successful end.'

The Abbé left the meeting at the conclusion of his address. The next morning he and M. Tavernier returned to Paris. Father Puller, who had arrived the day before in order to attend the meeting, spent that day with me in translating the Abbé's speech, and we succeeded in getting it sent to the printers the same evening. Three days later I received

the following letter from the Abbé, dated the 17th,¹ the letter having been preceded by a telegram announcing the difficulties with which he had been made acquainted on his return to Paris.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

PARIS, 17 juillet 1896.

Le soir de mon arrivée je recevais communication d'une lettre de l'archevêque de Paris à notre Supérieur général par laquelle on me priait de passer à l'archevêché pour recevoir communication d'une lettre du cardinal Perraud, écrite de Rome. Je viens de chez le cardinal Richard. Le cardinal Perraud lui écrit : 'Le Pape m'a dit qu'il réprouvait la *Revue Anglo-Romaine* qui se publie à Paris, chez Levé. Cette *Revue* est beaucoup trop entre les mains de Lord Halifax et des anglicans² qui veulent traiter d'égal à égal et non pas s'humilier simplement. Je suis chargé de vous faire connaître ces sentiments. En dehors du Vatican j'ai ouï dire qu'il était question de mettre la *Revue* à l'index. Je suis étonné que M. Portal, qui est Lazariste, soit autorisé à marcher dans cette voie.'

Voilà, mon cher ami, ce qui m'a été communiqué. L'archevêque m'a parlé de notre réunion de Londres. Il a reçu une

¹ Dom Gasquet, in an entry in his *Diary* of the same date, says : 'I heard to-day that Cardinal Vaughan had received a letter from Cardinal Perraud to the effect that the Pope had expressed himself very strongly on the attitude taken up by the Abbé Portal in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, the explaining away the Encyclical on the Church, . . .

'The Abbé Portal has been this week at a meeting of the English Church Union at Sion College (I think). It was not a public meeting, but circulars were sent inviting various people. One lady who was present described Portal's address to me. He began by saying that he would open his heart to those who thought with him. He said there was nothing in the Encyclical on "the Church" which need suggest any fear for "reunion" which did not necessarily mean "submission." The great obstacle to reunion was the bitterness and unreasonableness of *Roman Catholics* in England. He told them that although they were not under one and the same head, they might yet have full confidence that they possessed the entire sacramental system, and were true Catholics. The great obstacle to reunion was Cardinal Vaughan.' (Abbot Gasquet's *Leaves from My Diary*, 17th July 1896, pp. 73, 74.)

How much or how little truth there was in this statement may be seen by comparing it with the translation made by myself and Father Puller of the Abbé Portal's speech. The meeting was not held at Sion College, but at the Medical Hall on the Embankment.

² That it was so, if such was the case, was due to Cardinal Vaughan, who had objected to Mr. Wilfrid Ward and others writing in the *Revue*.

lettre par laquelle on lui apprend que je n'ai pas été assez explicite sur les prérogatives du Pape !¹ Selon le cardinal de Paris il n'y aurait pas lieu de désespérer, mais il faudrait bien s'assurer si vraiment nous sommes dans la bonne voie. Il a ajouté que souvent on comprenait le Pape avec ses idées propres, et non pas avec celles du Pape. Il m'a rappelé, à ce sujet, la campagne des congrégations où chacun croyait le Pape pour soi.² Je me suis borné à dire que, pour moi, la question n'est pas si je dois obéir, mais ce que je dois faire pour obéir. J'ai dit qu'avant de quitter Rome, il y a un mois environ, j'ai demandé au cardinal Rampolla si je devais continuer. Je le priais de m'avertir, si je n'étais pas dans la bonne voie. Il m'a répondu par un encouragement, banal sans doute, mais un encouragement, même banal, était un indice que nous ne déplaissions pas. Le cardinal Richard a été très bon. Il me conseillait presque d'aller à Rome. La situation comme vous le voyez est très grave. Il ne faut pourtant pas perdre la tête. Il y a, à Rome, tant de combinaisons qu'il ne faut jamais désespérer.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal.

EATON SQUARE, S.W.,
juillet 18, 1896.

Si j'ai bien saisi la portée de votre dépêche : on vous arrête. S'il est ainsi, entre tous mes autres regrets, il en est un qui s'impose au dessus de tout, c'est qu'encore une fois Rome a justifié tout ce qu'on m'a dit d'elle.

Les épreuves de votre discours étaient entre les mains du père Puller jeudi. C'était une rude besogne de le traduire.

A day or two later, Lady Halifax and I were obliged to leave London for Mont-Dore, where we had been ordered for Lady Halifax's health. We saw the Abbé on our way through Paris, who to some extent reassured me as to the position of affairs. Writing to him the next day, I say :—

Je ne saurais vous dire le soulagement que cela a été pour moi d'être un peu rassuré sur nos affaires.

¹ This was not the fact, although it was implied in the account given of the Abbé Portal's speech in the *Tablet*, Cardinal Vaughan's organ, which suppressed all the passages in the Abbé's speech which insisted on the rights of the Pope. See letter to Cardinal Parocchi of July 26th, p. 343.

² In reference to the law *d'accroissement*.

Quand je pense à la lettre du cardinal Perraud et à cette phrase : 'Qu'on ne veut pas s'humilier simplement,' je me demande si l'ignorance, et quelque chose de pire, peuvent aller plus loin. L'humiliation est un mot qui sonne fort mal aux oreilles d'un Anglais. Nous sommes tout prêts à reconnaître nos torts, mais c'est bien à la condition qu'on reconnaisse les torts qu'on a eus envers nous, et jamais je n'admettrai, qu'entre Rome et nous, les torts soient tous de notre côté.

Si cela devait être le dernier mot, il n'y a pas un seul de mes compatriotes qui ne serait prêt à pendre quiconque lui parlerait de Rome et d'union avec elle.

On the 24th the Abbé, who was himself unwell, stopped for a night at Mont-Dore on his way to the Pyrenees, and I heard from him that he had been told to abstain in future from any interference in English affairs, and that dissatisfaction had been expressed in high quarters with the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. He left Mont-Dore the next day, and after his departure, in view of the injustice which was being done him, and of the manner in which his conduct was being deliberately misrepresented, I sent the following letter to Mr. Lathbury, the editor of the London *Guardian*, and wrote both to Cardinal Rampolla and to Cardinal Parocchi in order to put them in possession of the facts and to ask what Cardinal Rampolla's wishes and those of the Pope really were. Did Cardinal Rampolla desire the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* to continue? Was it the Pope's wish that all that was being attempted in the way of corporate reunion should cease?

Lord Halifax to the Editor of the Guardian

In the report of the Abbé Portal's speech in London on Tuesday, 14th July, given by the *Tablet* in its last issue, which is copied from the *Guardian*, it will be observed that everything in that speech which relates to the Vatican Decrees as repeated and explained by the recent Encyclical, and to the prerogatives of the Holy See, is deliberately omitted, those portions of the speech only being reproduced which touch on the question of individual conversions.

It is known that efforts have been and are still being made

by certain persons in England to strangle, if possible, the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, and to silence the Abbé Portal, and that with this object it has been represented in high quarters that the action of the Abbé Portal discourages individual conversions, and ignores the prerogatives of the Holy See, as asserted and explained by the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*.

Put these two facts together, and the object of the suppressions in the *Tablet* is obvious. It is a pity such manœuvres should be adopted by the journal which is generally understood to be the organ of Cardinal Vaughan.

Further, the *Tablet* heads its reports of the speech by the statement that it has been informed by a person who was present at the meeting, that the accounts given in the *Guardian* and in some French newspapers of the Abbé's speech are not trustworthy.

The report of the Abbé's speech in the *Guardian* was taken down word for word and translated by myself. It is absolutely correct. The account in the *Univers*¹ was taken down quite independently by a writer on the staff of that journal who happened to be present.

I challenge the *Tablet* to publish the name of its informant who, if he has not been misrepresented, has deliberately stated what is not true.

*Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Parocchi*²

GRAND HÔTEL, MONT-DORE,

PUY DE DÔME, July 26, 1896.

I have been wishing for some time to thank your Eminence for all the kindness shown to my friends Father Puller and Mr. Lacey when they were at Rome this summer, and at the same time to assure your Eminence that the recollection of the same kindness which your Eminence extended to me last year is very fresh in my memory.

My friends assure me that your Eminence is as much interested as ever in the cause of reunion, a fact indeed of which I needed no assurance from them, but which determines me not to put off any longer writing to your Eminence.

Indeed, I feel it would be impossible to put the duty off any longer in consequence of the serious communication I have to make to your Eminence in regard to certain matters affecting

¹ See *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, vol. ii. p. 737, and vol. iii. p. 24.

² The Cardinal-Vicar—a good English scholar.

the cause of reunion at the present moment. Your Eminence will find enclosed extracts from English newspapers giving an account of a speech made by the Abbé Portal in London. Your Eminence will at once perceive their importance, but I may nevertheless perhaps be allowed to make two or three observations in regard to them.

In the first place, there can be no doubt that as far as English public opinion was concerned, the appearance of the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* was not altogether opportune, but, desiring reunion as we do with all our hearts, and it being no longer possible to prepare in our own way, and as was most likely to lead to fruitful results, the public mind in England for the consideration of the Vatican decrees, which the Encyclical in fact repeats and explains, we thought it best to approach the subject at once. The difficulty in the way of success was, however, all the greater in consequence of the manner in which the Encyclical had been published in England, and the significance which certain comments prefixed, attached to it. It was sought in the press to imply that the Encyclical was an answer to Mr. Gladstone, and to all that he has been doing within the last two years on behalf of union, and further, that the Pope refused to consider the question of corporate reunion, and only desired individual conversions.

These were the circumstances under which we decided to hold the meeting of which your Eminence will find the account in the extract from the *Guardian* newspaper marked (1). Your Eminence will see from it that the questions involved in the Encyclical and the prerogatives of the Pope were directly faced. Every one present, as the result of the Abbé Portal's speech, felt that it was their duty to resist any feeling of discouragement, in pursuing the work of reunion, and to promote the renewal of such efforts on the basis claimed for the Vatican Decrees by the Encyclical. An important member of the staff of the *Univers* was present, who has in that journal borne witness to the earnest desire for union and the excellent spirit which seemed to animate all who were there.

Secondly, I have heard that very serious decisions, no doubt on erroneous information, are likely to be taken shortly at Rome. It is said that the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* is about to be suppressed. In any case it is quite certain that the Abbé Portal is much blamed, and that he has been forbidden to take any further part in the movement for reunion. If this is so, it is a proof that a

line of conduct is being adopted in the highest quarter which will be nothing less than disastrous. It will be to repeat, in modern forms, and in the methods of the nineteenth century, the mistakes of the sixteenth, and with the same consequences.

As far as we are concerned, we have done our best to promote reunion. I do not think the same thing will be able to be said of others. Your Eminence will excuse the liberty I am taking in writing so freely, but I am encouraged to do so by my knowledge of the intimate acquaintance your Eminence possesses with English affairs, English ideas, and with our national characteristics.

It is then as a friend of England that I address your Eminence, in the hope that your Eminence may not be indisposed to exert the great influence your Eminence is known to possess, to avert what would be so great a misfortune.

Extract (1) is the full text of the Abbé Portal's speech, taken down from notes by myself, compared with the notes made by the Abbé, and for the completeness and exact accuracy of which I pledge my word, given by the *Guardian*, which is one of the very best of our English newspapers, and with the most important circulation among the clergy and laity of the Church of England.

Extract (2) is the account of the Abbé Portal's speech given in the *Tablet*,¹ the organ of Cardinal Vaughan. I beg your Eminence very earnestly to compare the account given in the *Tablet* with that in the *Guardian*, and to observe the portions of the Abbé Portal's speech which, although it is quoting from the *Guardian*, the *Tablet* omits. Everything connected with the Encyclical, everything in regard to the prerogatives of the Holy See is deliberately suppressed. Those portions only are retained which deal with individual conversions, and which, separated from the parts suppressed, are susceptible of, and indeed suggest, an entirely false impression. The object of such suppression is obvious; it is to injure the Abbé Portal, and to further the efforts which are being made in certain quarters to put a stop to his work. I forbear to characterise such a proceeding as it deserves.

Cardinal Parocchi had at the time this letter was written, been appointed Secretary to the Holy Office, which, as he explained, made correspondence on his part on such subjects

¹ See *Tablet*, 25th July.

impossible ; he, however, added a sentence to the effect that despite all opposition, agreement ought not to be difficult.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla

GRAND HÔTEL, MONT-DORE,
PUY DE DÔME, 26 juillet 1896.

Je viens de recevoir de si graves nouvelles qu'il m'est impossible de ne pas écrire à votre Eminence. La *Revue Anglo-Romaine* serait sur le point de disparaître parce qu'elle déplaît et, ce qui est un fait avéré, et qui me touche profondément, l'abbé Portal aurait reçu défense de s'occuper désormais de nos affaires ; la défense aurait été déterminée par son récent discours à Londres dans lequel il aurait dû, paraît-il, parler de soumission et non pas d'union. Les services qu'a rendus la *Revue* sont inappréciables, elle a été et elle pouvait être un puissant instrument pour dissiper les préjugés, et jamais les catholiques romains n'auront un meilleur moyen pour faire pénétrer leurs idées dans notre milieu. Aujourd'hui son titre seul est un symbole d'union, et sa disparition serait regardée comme un grand malheur par tous les amis de la paix. Sa disparition semblerait donner raison à ceux qui chez nous ont toujours soutenu que Rome ne voulait pas sincèrement l'union. Pour ce qui touche l'abbé Portal votre Eminence sait mieux que personne quels services il a rendus à la cause de l'union. Je n'insisterai que sur sa dernière démarche qui a été la cause, sans doute sur de faux rapports, de l'espèce de disgrâce qui le frappe.

Les journaux français donneront j'espère la traduction de son discours qui a paru avant-hier dans le *Guardian*, un de nos principaux journaux. Je prierai votre Eminence de noter que le *Tablet*, l'organe du cardinal Vaughan, en citant le rapport de ce discours dans le *Guardian*, supprime tout ce qui touche à l'Encyclique et aux droits du Saint Siège.

Votre Eminence verra dans le rapport authentique du *Guardian* dont je garantis l'exactitude absolue avec quelle netteté l'abbé a posé la question des prérogatives du Pape. Puisque le Saint Père jugeait opportun de parler d'abord de ce point doctrinal, il était de notre devoir de nous placer sur ce terrain au lieu de nous laisser décourager par les difficultés de l'entreprise et par la signification que certains ont voulu donner chez nous à l'apparition de l'Encyclique. Votre Eminence sait qu'on a tout mis en

œuvre pour la présenter comme une réponse à Mr. Gladstone et à tout ce qui a été fait de notre côté pendant ces dernières années pour la réunion. C'est pour cela que la conférence a eu lieu. Elle a eu pour résultat de donner confiance aux nôtres et de leur faire voir dans les bases données par l'Encyclique la possibilité d'un accord avec les Décrets du Concile du Vatican.

Je puis assurer à votre Eminence que l'abbé Portal a fait plus dans deux ans pour conduire les esprits chez nous à envisager cette possibilité qu'on n'a fait depuis la séparation. Les faits le prouvent. On a la plus parfaite confiance dans sa loyauté et bien peu auraient pu parler chez nous comme il l'a fait.

J'ose dire à votre Eminence que de notre côté nous avons fait tout le possible, et je doute fort que de longtemps une occasion aussi favorable se présente pour cette œuvre d'union qui est tellement nécessaire pour l'Eglise et pour le salut des âmes.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

MONT-DORE, 26 juillet 1896.

J'espère que vous approuverez ce que j'ai fait. Je me suis décidé à écrire à Rome. Voici les copies des lettres qui sont parties pour le cardinal Parocchi et pour le cardinal Rampolla. Renvoyez-les-moi, s'il vous plaît.

Je ne sais si l'œuvre pourra continuer, mais ce qui est assuré c'est que si elle continue sans vous, le plaisir que j'y prenais est détruit. C'est cette pensée et la manière dont on vous traite qui m'afflige si profondément.

Mais, peut-être, il est mieux de se taire, et je n'en parlerai plus. Seulement sachez une fois pour toutes, que je souffre avec vous et pour vous de toute mon âme.

Une chose reste. Dieu récompense ceux qui souffrent : c'est ma consolation et mon espoir.

H. E. Cardinal Rampolla to Lord Halifax

3 août 1896.

La franchise avec laquelle vous venez de m'exprimer vos appréhensions du moment m'oblige à vous donner des explications capables de vous faire bien saisir la pensée du Saint-Siège dans les affaires qui vous occupent depuis quelque temps. Tout d'abord j'aime à vous dire que personne ne doute de la loyauté de vos intentions, de sorte que vous ne devez pas vous décourager.

Mais vous savez que le Saint-Père s'occupe de l'Angleterre avec autant de zèle que de persévérance, vous n'ignorez pas l'intérêt tout particulier que Sa Sainteté manifeste pour cette branche de la famille chrétienne. Son Encyclique *Ad Anglos* et l'étude de très importantes questions qui s'est faite sous ses yeux, avec toute impartialité et avec l'intervention de plusieurs théologiens anglais, sont là pour le prouver. Or, dans de tels moments et en présence de telles circonstances, on ne pouvait pas se féliciter de voir traiter ces mêmes questions si graves et si délicates par des personnes qui n'ont pas sous les yeux tous les documents, et dont la compétence dans la matière n'est pas bien assurée. Il est arrivé, en effet, que l'on a ouvert la discussion d'une façon inexacte, et quelquefois même erronée; de sorte que la bonne cause n'a pu en tirer aucun profit, et au contraire une confusion très dangereuse en a été le résultat.¹ C'est pour de tels motifs que l'abbé Portal a dû recevoir des avertissements de la part de ses supérieurs; aucun blâme n'a été infligé ni à sa loyauté ni aux bonnes intentions dont il a pu s'inspirer.

Les affaires sont si graves et le moment est si important que, pour ne pas se tromper, il n'y a d'autre chemin à suivre que l'étude sérieuse et attentive des documents publiés par le Saint-Père lui-même. Sa Sainteté, en les publiant, ne s'est inspirée que du désir d'éclairer les esprits et de franchir pour eux le chemin qui mène à la vérité. Vous en avez la preuve dans la dernière Encyclique *Satis Cognitum*, qui est le fruit des longues études et des profondes méditations auxquelles s'est livré le Saint-Père pour arriver à mettre sous les yeux de tout observateur impartial l'unité de l'Eglise, telle que son divin Fondateur l'a voulue. Le but de Sa Sainteté n'a été que celui-ci, et le déclarer c'est ce qui suffit pour écarter la supposition que l'Encyclique ne soit qu'une réponse à la lettre de M. Gladstone.

J'espère, Monsieur le Vicomte, vous avoir fait chose agréable en vous donnant ces explications.

¹ This sentence, the meaning of which was extremely obscure at the time, since it was difficult to suppose it referred to the Abbé Portal's address delivered in London, is rendered intelligible by a reference to a passage in the Bull *Apostolicae curae*, published six weeks later, 'Quae quum ita sint, non videt nemo controversiam temporibus nostris exsuscitatam, Apostolicae Sedis judicio definitam multo antea fuisse: documentisque illis haud satis quam oportuerat cognitis, fortasse factum ut scriptor aliquis catholicus disputationem de ea libere habere non dubitavit.'

A comparison of this passage with Cardinal Rampolla's letter to the Abbé Portal of the 19th September 1894 (see p. 153) is sufficient to show how great a change had taken place in the sentiments of the Vatican.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

MONT-DORE, 7 août 1896.

Voici la réponse du cardinal Rampolla ; elle vient d'arriver. Je n'y vois pas grand'chose ; seulement la phrase 'qu'il ne faut pas me décourager' semble rappeler ce qu'on nous a dit l'année passée, et pourrait indiquer qu'on ne s'est pas tout à fait mis dans les mains du cardinal Vaughan. De l'autre côté, 'la manière erronée dont on aurait ouvert la discussion' et 'la confusion très dangereuse qui en a été le résultat' sembleraient être tout à fait dans le sens du cardinal. Je me demande ce que tout cela veut dire.

Mon idée serait de remercier le cardinal de sa lettre et de ses explications, mais de lui dire nettement que je n'y comprends rien, vu que le but de votre discours à Londres était précisément de faire méditer l'Encyclique *Satis Cognitum*, et cependant que c'est bien ce discours qui vous a valu les avertissements dont il parle. J'ajouterai que je suis convaincu qu'il doit y avoir des malentendus, que vous éloigner de l'œuvre c'est courir le risque de compromettre son succès, que les nôtres sont prêts à vous écouter avec des dispositions qu'on n'accorderait pas à un autre, ce que je crois de la dernière importance pour la réussite des vœux de Léon XIII. En y réfléchissant il me semble hors de doute qu'une telle lettre s'impose. J'écirai dans ce sens au cardinal demain.

*Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla*GRAND HÔTEL,
MONT-DORE, 9 août 1896.

Je viens de recevoir la très gracieuse lettre que votre Eminence a eu la bonté de m'adresser, et je m'empresse avant de partir ce soir pour l'Angleterre, de témoigner à votre Eminence la reconnaissance que je ressens pour des explications dont j'apprécie pleinement toute l'importance.

Que votre Eminence me dise de ne pas me décourager est pour moi un grand soulagement. Toutefois j'ose croire que votre Eminence me permettra de lui exprimer la crainte que je ressens de ne pas avoir bien saisi la portée de ce que dit votre Eminence 'sur la façon inexacte dont on a ouvert la discussion' et 'sur la confusion très dangereuse qui en a été le résultat.' Il

me semble impossible que ces paroles puissent se rapporter à la conférence qu'a faite l'abbé Portal à Londres. Les supérieurs de l'abbé Portal auront sans doute mal compris les désirs du Saint-Père, mais ils ne se sont pas bornés à lui donner des avertissements ; il a reçu défense formelle de s'occuper désormais en quoi que ce fût, de la question anglicane.

Or, l'occasion de cette défense a été justement la conférence de Londres qui avait pour but de mettre tout le mouvement sur le terrain indiqué par le Saint-Père, c'est-à-dire sur l'Encyclique *Satis Cognitum*. Personne n'aurait pu parler à un tel auditoire comme l'a fait l'abbé Portal, et avec un nouvel effort on aurait été à peu près sûr de ressaisir les esprits. Mais si en ce moment on brise l'Abbé Portal c'est non seulement rendre cet effort presque impossible, mais aussi jeter un blâme sur cette démarche de Londres,¹ et paraître marquer qu'on ne veut pas d'union. Car si Rome blâme un tel discours, et une telle tentative, aux yeux de tous, c'est qu'on ne veut pas d'union même sur le terrain de l'Encyclique, mais seulement des conversions individuelles. S'il en est ainsi, et tout portera à le croire, votre Eminence peut être assurée que tous ceux, en Angleterre, qui désirent l'union n'auront qu'à s'arrêter, et attendre des temps meilleurs.

Il restera établi en tout cas, qu'ils ont fait tout leur possible pour la réalisation de l'œuvre entreprise avec l'agrément du Saint Père.

Je ne sais s'il ne serait pas bon que M. Portal allât à Rome fournir des explications.

Son Eminence, le cardinal de Paris, lui en a parlé il y a trois semaines. Mais en ce moment M. Portal l'a jugé inutile. Il était d'ailleurs très fatigué et le médecin lui prescrivait d'urgence trois ou quatre semaines de repos complet.

Je prie très instamment votre Eminence de vouloir bien me pardonner la complète franchise avec laquelle j'écris. C'est que je ne puis oublier toutes les bontés que votre Eminence m'a témoignées.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla

Août 10 or 11, 1896.

Votre Eminence veut-elle me permettre d'ajouter un mot à ma lettre d'hier. En passant par Paris, j'ai appris que le cardinal de Paris a reçu de Rome des félicitations pour avoir fait suspendre

¹ I had seen M. Levé and M. Tavernier in Paris on my way to England.

la publication de la *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. Votre Eminence comprendra que, dans de telles circonstances, il est indispensable qu'il y ait une franchise complète et mutuelle. Si Rome ne veut pas d'union en corps, je ne puis plus continuer la campagne. La *Revue* semble devoir être condamnée par Rome. Par exemple on a reproché à la *Revue* de laisser une place prépondérante aux travaux anglicans. On a tout fait pour obtenir la collaboration des catholiques anglais. Votre Eminence sait sans doute que le cardinal Vaughan s'est opposé autant qu'il a pu, à ce que cette collaboration nous fût donnée.¹

Est-ce donc qu'on ne veut pas d'union en corps, mais seulement des conversions individuelles ? S'il en est ainsi, c'est la négation de notre raison d'être, et il me serait absolument impossible de continuer à travailler dans un but qui m'attirerait de la part des miens les blâmes les plus sévères. La campagne a été engagée sur le terrain de l'union en corps, sans méconnaître ce qui pourrait être, dans certains cas donnés, le devoir individuel.

Sous ce rapport il ne peut y avoir le moindre malentendu à mon égard.

Mais si Rome ne poursuit exclusivement que des conversions individuelles,—et à moins d'une assurance contraire et formelle, il devient difficile d'en douter,—il est impossible de continuer. Ni l'œuvre que je poursuis, ni ma personne n'ont rien à gagner à ce que je paraisse, aux yeux des miens, mériter le reproche de faire métier de dupe.

H. E. Cardinal Rampolla to Lord Halifax

ROME, 24 août 1896.

Vous avez bien voulu m'assurer du plaisir que vous ont causé les explications apportées par ma dernière lettre ; je crois donc que ne vous seront pas moins agréables les éclaircissements que je crois devoir vous donner par rapport à certains points dont il est question dans vos lettres du 9 et du 11 courant. Et tout d'abord, permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il n'est pas exact qu'à Rome on se borne à désirer des conversions individuelles, ne voulant pas l'union en corps : il est vrai seulement qu'on ne veut pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succès est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps. On n'est pas dans le vrai non plus lorsqu'on suppose que la *Revue Anglo-Romaine* a été condamnée ; ceci

¹ See letter of 1st May 1896.

n'est pas arrivé, et n'arrivera pas, surtout si ses rédacteurs veulent bien se tenir sur leurs gardes, et ne pas devancer le jugement du Saint-Père sur les questions dont il s'est réservé la solution. En attendant, Sa Sainteté désire que sa dernière Encyclique—*de Unitate Ecclesiae*—soit l'objet de méditations sérieuses de la part des Anglais : naturellement ces études ne doivent pas aboutir à des interprétations contraires à celle qui jaillit de la pensée si clairement exposée par le Saint-Père lui-même, mais à votre œil si pénétrant il n'échappe pas, Monsieur le Vicomte, quel vaste champ reste encore ouvert à l'activité des bons Anglais, et même de l'abbé Portal, pour correspondre aux intentions du Saint-Père. Quant à vous, monsieur, vous devez vous aussi en tirer une bonne conclusion pratique, c'est-à-dire ne pas vous décourager, et, tout au contraire, garder vos bonnes intentions de travailler autant que possible à rendre réelle et facile l'union si désirable.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Rampolla

HICKLETON, DONCASTER,
YORKSHIRE, 2 septembre 1896.

Une absence de quelques jours dans le nord a retardé la réception de la lettre envoyée par votre Eminence le 24 août.

Que votre Eminence me permette de lui exprimer la vive reconnaissance que je ressens pour une lettre si claire et si loyale. Elle fera le plus grand bien aux quelques personnes à qui je la montrerai, et produira la meilleure impression particulièrement sur ceux qu'il est d'une importance spéciale d'éclairer.

Les assurances que votre Eminence daigne me donner au sujet de la *Revue Anglo-Romaine* me font le plus vif plaisir. Cette *Revue* qui est lue par la plupart de nos évêques, et par l'élite du clergé de l'Eglise anglicane, est destinée à jouer un grand rôle dans la pacification des esprits. Elle fait un grand bien chez nous, car par elle dans un langage prudent et modéré on apprend à connaître la doctrine romaine, et votre Eminence, je crois, n'a pas besoin que je lui dise que d'être bien disposé à écouter est déjà un progrès énorme.

Votre Eminence veut-elle me permettre d'ajouter un mot au sujet de l'abbé Portal. J'espère vivement que ses Supérieurs, avertis des véritables intentions du Saint-Père, ne le feront pas quitter Paris, et ne l'empêcheront pas de travailler à l'œuvre de l'union.

Je puis assurer votre Eminence que l'abbé Portal peut faire

plus que toute autre personne pour faire pénétrer dans notre milieu les pensées et les désirs du Saint-Père, et qu'il mérite bien la confiance qu'on lui a donnée à Rome, car s'il est charitable dans les procédés (ce que beaucoup ne sont pas), pour le fond, aussi bien dans les conversations privées qu'en public, il a toujours été très ferme sur les prérogatives du Pape.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON, septembre 1896.

Voici la lettre qui m'arrive du cardinal Rampolla. N'est-ce pas que la vie de la *Revue* est assurée ? Renvoyez-moi la lettre et dites-moi ce que vous en pensez. Il faut que vous lisiez le *Tablet*.¹ Hérétique est le moindre des noms qu'on vous applique.

On vient de publier les sujets qui doivent être traités par les évêques à Lambeth, l'année prochaine. La réunion avec l'Orient et avec Rome se trouve parmi les questions posées. Voyez-vous, mon cher ami, comme tout était en train de s'arranger selon nos désirs ! Avec un voyage² aux États-Unis au mois d'octobre, et un peu d'intelligence et de bonne volonté de la part de Rome, le Pape aurait tout enlevé ! et maintenant !

¹ The *Tablet* had said : 'The status of the Anglican Church' is that 'of a sect in manifest heresy and schism,' and 'as such as hateful as the contradictions of Korah, Dathan and Abiram'; that the Abbé's speech could be understood in only one of two ways. In the one case it was illogical; in the other un-Catholic; it was illogical if it sought for corporate reunion with a sect; it was 'erroneous and heretical,' and 'directly opposed to the teaching of Leo XIII. and to the plain principles of faith and theology' if it looked upon the Church of England as anything but a sect. Any such recognition of the Anglican body could only be made by 'the betrayal of the most sacred principles of the Catholic Faith.' The 'Abbé Portal's views were un-Catholic,' the 'tendency of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*' mischievous, and if it 'persisted in its methods it should be extinguished by the action of ecclesiastical authority.' 'Its attitude towards English Catholics and the Prelates who rule over them' was 'unseemly and outrageous.' The Abbé Portal's conduct was 'an affront to the Pope' by representing Leo XIII. to have said what 'it is certain' he 'did not say'; it was further 'an invasion of the jurisdiction of the English Bishops,' an invasion of 'the diocese of the Cardinal Archbishop,' and in consequence a violation of 'the requirements of Catholic orders.' 'The *Revue* was to all intents and purposes an Anglican organ, which it would be well to get rid of.'

² In view of the meeting at Lambeth to commemorate the threehundredth anniversary of the landing of St. Augustine, and to prepare the way for the letter from the Pope which I had hoped might have been addressed to the Episcopate in communion with Canterbury, the members of which were to assemble at that time, I had intended to go to America in the autumn in order to interest the American bishops in the cause of reunion.

CHAPTER XIV

ISSUE OF THE BULL *Apostolicae Curae*, AND TRIUMPH OF CARDINAL VAUGHAN—CORRESPONDENCE UP TO THE END OF 1896—SUMMARY OF THE *Risposta* BY MGR. MOYES AND ABBOT GASQUET IN REPLY TO THE *De Re Anglicana* BY REV. T. A. LACEY.

THE destruction of the hopes the Abbé Portal and I had cherished, which at one moment had run so high, the end of all that the Pope had intended, and for which so many had laboured and prayed, was at hand. The foundations we had sought to lay, on which others might build and carry on the work for the reunion of Christendom, were not to be laid by us: the blow was as sudden as it was unexpected. On the 18th of September Lady Beauchamp, who arrived at Hickleton late, brought an evening paper announcing the issue of a Bull declaring the Orders conferred by the Church of England to be null and void, and the next day I received a telegram from the Abbé Portal to the same effect. Writing to the Abbé in reply, I say:—

Si les nouvelles qui m'arrivaient hier et votre dépêche sont exactes, notre œuvre est finie. Le cardinal, Moyes et Gasquet triomphent. Il est vrai que c'est une victoire qui est pire qu'une défaite, mais il faut avouer aussi que pour le moment elle est complète. Mais c'est inutile de parler avant de savoir les faits. J'attends avec impatience d'autres nouvelles—quant à moi personnellement, j'ai trouvé un ami, et cela me console pour tout.

Ne faudrait-il pas une dernière lettre, article, ou enfin quelque chose de Lacey ou de moi dans la *Revue* avant qu'elle disparaisse ?

J'étais en train d'écrire au cardinal Rampolla. Je m'arrête jusqu'à ce que je sache où nous en sommes.

Ah ! mon cher ami, quelle histoire !

La parole de Galilée exprimait ma pensée en lisant votre dépêche.

Mr. Birkbeck, who had also heard the news, wrote the same day :—

How miserable the news from Rome is. Of course we have not seen the text of the Letter Apostolic yet, but I fear there isn't anything to be hoped for from it. It really is astonishing that the Pope should do anything so foolish. As far as the English Roman Catholics are concerned, it will after all be but a Pyrrhic victory, for I don't suppose a single English Churchman of any consequence will go over on the strength of this decision, far less any large number, as seems to be expected at Rome. But I am very sorry for the Abbé and for all our friends in France and elsewhere, who have been doing so much to bring about a better feeling. It is altogether too disappointing, and I feel quite overcome with disheartenment and disgust. But, anyhow, all that you and the Abbé have done won't have been thrown away; and besides the satisfaction from a Christian point of view of thinking that you did all that you could in the interests of peace and unity, you will feel that as a precedent for similar negotiations at some future time it will be invaluable.

The publication of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* was announced by an article in the *Times* of the 19th September. The writer was again the faithful interpreter of Cardinal Vaughan's opinions and the no less faithful exponent of all he wished to have said. It would have been impossible, in fact, to give expression to the one or to represent the other with greater accuracy.¹ 'The long and exhaustive study under the Pope's direction,' the article said, 'declaring the Orders conferred by the English Church absolutely invalid, will be a shock to well-meaning members of the Anglican Communion, and puts an end to all hope that the

¹ Archbishop Benson enters in his Diary: '29th September.—A downright Roman Catholic article in the *Times*'; and writing to the Bishop of Winchester (the Rt. Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson) two days later, the Archbishop says: 'But what do you now say about the *Times*? Surely there can be no doubt now that it has an undeniable Roman Catholic tone—the article on the Encyclical and the Article which accompanies Vaughan's oration are absolutely Roman, only the fingers that write are covered roughly with the skin of the kids'—Archbishop Benson's *Life*, vol. ii. pp. 725-727.

Pope will smooth the road for reunion of the two Churches by at least recognising that the Anglican Church exists as a Church.' . . . 'The Pope has set his seal on the established tradition of his own Church.' . . . 'Mr. Gladstone, in the light of information which he had been allowed by the kindness of Lord Halifax to share,' had had no fear that the 'Pope's investigation would result in a proscription of Anglican Orders.' . . . Mr. Gladstone and his friends must now dismiss what 'Cardinal Vaughan has termed 'vague and hazy theories resting only on delusive hopes.' 'They are informed that they are outside the fold, and that it is for them to return to it': 'they are treated as mere outcasts': 'they are denied all share in the most sacred mysteries of the Church,' and 'denied all benefit from the miraculous powers which their invalid clergy have been professing to exercise.' 'They can hardly receive the Pope's sentence with indifference, so eagerly have they committed themselves to the fond hopes they have been basing upon it.' . . . 'There remains, however, a large section of the clergy and a larger section of the laity who have no reason to suppose that the Pope intends to throw doubt on the validity of their Orders in the only sense they attach to the words,' . . . and 'if the Pope's Apostolic letters put an end to delusive hopes and close a dispute which had better never have been started, they will not have been without their use.' The party 'which has drawn them from him [the Pope] will have learnt too late the wisdom of the old proverb, "Let sleeping dogs lie."' The article concluded with another reference to 'the information which Mr. Gladstone had been allowed through the kindness of Lord Halifax to share,' and to Mr. Gladstone's own anticipation that 'the labours of His Holiness Leo XIII. would be in furtherance of the cause of truth and peace.' It ended by saying: 'We are thankful to the Pope for having so clearly defined his own position and that of the Anglican Church, in language which no party in that Church could ever again pretend to misunderstand or misinterpret.'

Two days later I received the following letter from the Abbé:—

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

19 septembre 1896.

Vers quatre heures de l'après midi, j'ai eu hier communication de la dépêche reçue par l'*Univers*. Inutile de vous dire ce que nous avons ressenti MM. Courcelle,¹ Levé et moi. Notre pensée première a été pour vous, pour nos amis d'Angleterre, Puller, Lacey, etc. Pauvres amis qui avez été si bons, si généreux, si loyaux ! Il n'y a qu'à se taire et à courber la tête. Je ne parle avec personne. Le coup est si profond, d'ailleurs, et la douleur si forte que je ne ressens plus rien.

Que Notre Seigneur ait pitié de nous. Qu'il nous accorde du moins la consolation de voir de nos yeux que nous n'avons pas fait plus de mal que de bien. Vous et les vôtres vous y avez mis trop de foi, trop d'abnégation, pour que vos actes de vertu et vos sacrifices de toute sorte soient perdus. Ils serviront grandement au salut de vos âmes, et aussi, contre toute espérance, j'espère, à la réunion. Je vous dois mes meilleures joies, mon cher ami : travailler et souffrir pour l'Eglise. Je vous donne ce que j'ai de meilleur en mon âme d'affection et d'inaltérable dévouement. Je ressens votre grande douleur, et je souffre plus à cause de vous qu'à cause de moi.

La *Revue* paraît aujourd'hui sans rien annoncer. Le prochain numéro portera le document, une page que nous avons fabriquée, M. Levé et moi, et ce sera la fin—la fin d'un beau rêve. Votre dépêche rappelle une autre condamnation, et le mot du père de Augustinis.² Que tout cela fait mal, et comme une pareille épreuve envahit l'être entier.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

HICKLETON septembre 21, 1896.

Votre lettre me remplit les yeux de larmes, mais elle me fait un bien qui est au delà de toute expression. C'était bien l'amour des âmes qui nous poussait, nous ne voulions pas autre chose. Qu'on fit quelque chose pour mettre fin aux divisions entre ceux qui aiment notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, ces divisions qui servent à tenir tant d'âmes éloignées de Lui ; que ceux qui s'aiment pussent s'aimer d'avantage, en communiant aux mêmes autels ;

¹ M. Maurice Courcelle, Secretary of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*.² I had alluded to the condemnation of Galileo.

qu'enfin, l'unité essentielle de l'Eglise de Jésus Christ fût reconnue de tous, et que pour cela, dans un esprit d'amour et de charité, dans un esprit aussi de pénitence pour toutes les fautes commises de chaque côté, on s'abordât, afin de dissiper les malentendus, de distinguer entre ce qui est de foi, et ce qui est seulement matière d'opinion, de dissiper les préjugés et de rechercher tout simplement la volonté de Dieu comme il l'a fait connaître à ses Saints Apôtres, et comme elle a été comprise par l'Eglise des premiers temps, de se fonder enfin sur les bases demandées par l'Encyclique pour la foi et la pratique chrétienne : voila, mon cher ami, tout ce que nous voulions. Je suppose que les autres le voulaient aussi. Mais pour y arriver il fallait beaucoup d'amour, beaucoup de charité, beaucoup de patience, une grande abnégation de soi, et encore la sagesse qui sait distinguer entre les faits, et, plus que tout, il fallait cet esprit inspiré par l'amour qui, au delà de toutes les difficultés, et malgré toutes les apparences, voit la vérité essentielle telle qu'elle l'est véritablement en elle-même, et qui, pour la faire prévaloir, néglige toute considération personnelle, se fiant aux autres comme à soi-même. Voilà ce qu'il fallait, voilà justement ce qui a fait défaut. Il est difficile de parler sans avoir le texte du document. Je ne puis encore me convaincre qu'il est tout ce qu'on dit. Mais ce n'est pas douteux qu'il réalise, si le télégramme de Reuter est exact, les vœux du cardinal Vaughan, et de son entourage, et c'est ce fait qui les condamne. On dira d'eux que, soit faute d'intelligence, soit faute de quelque chose de beaucoup plus important, ils ont manqué aux desseins de Dieu. On dira qu'ils avaient l'occasion de faire le plus grand bien à l'Eglise, de faire beaucoup pour le salut des âmes, et qu'ils ne l'ont pas voulu.

Mais, je les laisse. Pour nous, mon cher ami, qu'avons nous à nous reprocher ? Nous avons essayé de faire ce que Dieu, je crois, nous avait inspiré. Nous avons échoué pour le moment, mais si Dieu le veut, sa volonté s'accomplira, et s'il nous permet d'être brisés c'est bien qu'il veut faire les choses lui-même. Ce n'est pas un rêve. La chose est aussi certaine que jamais. Il y a des amertumes qui valent toutes les joies de la terre, et je préfère mille et mille fois souffrir avec vous dans une telle cause que de triompher avec le monde entier. Votre lettre m'est précieuse au delà de tout ce que je puis vous dire. Les peines sont déjà à moitié soulagées quand on souffre ensemble ; seulement, je sais bien que si nous souffrons, vous souffrez encore davantage, et c'est cette pensée-là qui me fait le plus de mal. J'attends

avec impatience la lettre de dimanche que votre dépêche m'annonce.

Encore une fois, à vous de tout mon cœur, et cela aujourd'hui plus que jamais, et pour toujours.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

BISHOPTHORPE, YORK,

8 h. du soir, 22 septembre 1896.

L'archevêque d'York m'a prié de venir ici. Nous allons causer après dîner.

L'archevêque est admirable. Il n'a pas dit un seul mot sévère ; tout ce qu'il veut, c'est qu'on ne se décourage pas, et qu'on n'abandonne pas l'espoir de l'union.

Le cardinal Vaughan m'a écrit une lettre. Il commence en disant qu'il sait que je le juge très sévèrement, mais qu'enfin il voudrait me voir, etc., pour parler de la situation. Je suis en train de méditer ma réponse. Malgré tout ce qui est arrivé cette lettre me donne envie de rire chaque fois que j'y pense. Je ne pouvais pas en croire mes yeux quand j'ai vu son écriture.

Je crois qu'il serait bon de publier le mémoire que Lacey m'a envoyé de Gasquet et de Moyes, *Risposta all' Opuscolo intitolato De Re Anglicana*, écrit sans doute pour les cardinaux. Qu'on sache qu'ils ont écrit de telles pages, et qu'on les juge d'après ce qu'ils ont écrit eux-mêmes, c'est tout ce que je veux.

PS.—L'archevêque m'a prié deux ou trois fois de vous dire de sa part combien il vous remerciait de tout ce que vous aviez fait, que rien ne pouvait détruire ce qui avait été accompli pour l'œuvre de la réunion, et qu'il souffrait avec vous de tout son cœur, qu'il ne fallait pas cependant se décourager, qu'un bien énorme avait été fait, et qu'il fallait avoir patience et être bien sûr que Dieu mènerait tout à une bonne fin, etc. Il vous aime bien.

The Abbé Portal to Lord Halifax

28 septembre 1896.

Veuillez dire à l'Archevêque d'York combien je suis touché de la sympathie qu'il veut bien avoir pour moi.

Quoi qu'il arrive, je n'oublierai jamais les douces émotions de piété et de foi que j'ai ressenties à Bishopthorpe et chez vous, en l'entendant parler de notre chère œuvre d'union. Il n'est hereusement au pouvoir de personne de m'arracher ces chers souvenirs, ceux-là et bien d'autres.

La lettre apostolique explique clairement que la politique

d'union s'est trouvée en présence d'une cause jugée par le Saint-Office en Session solennelle présidée par le Pape, c'est-à-dire en une séance du jeudi (*feria quinta*). Or, il est une école à Rome qui regarde les jugements rendus dans cette séance comme infaillibles. Le cardinal Mazzella s'est mis sur ce terrain. Vous comprenez comme aux yeux de ces personnes, notre mouvement a été funeste. Il y a eu lutte, et c'est le pot de fer, le Saint Office, qui l'a emporté.

The *Risposta*, above referred to,¹ by Mgr. Moyes and Dom Gasquet, however valueless in itself, and however misleading as to the facts it purported to relate, is interesting as witnessing to the fears which had been entertained by Cardinal Vaughan and those who represented him as to possible action on the part of the Pope, as showing the kind of information supplied to the cardinals composing the Commission which was to decide on the question of the validity of the Orders conferred by the Church of England, and for the proof it affords of the animus of those who composed it. It was entitled *Risposta all' Opuscolo De Re Anglicana*. The *De Re Anglicana* was a statement written by Mr. Lacey in consequence of having been informed by one of the cardinals, to whom the question of the English Ordinations was to be submitted, that he knew nothing whatever about the English Church, and would welcome information. 'There are plenty of men,' Mr. Lacey and Father Puller were told, 'ready to say all that can be said against you, there are none to present the other aspect of the case unless you do it yourselves.' The *De Re Anglicana* did not pretend to be anything but an *ex parte* statement, but its critics have yet to disprove the facts contained in it.

The following extracts will convey some impression of the contents of the *Risposta*. Its method was to print successive extracts from the pamphlet to which it was an answer, and then to give a reply. The historical statements contained in those replies were absolutely one-sided and misleading. I may give one example: 'All the bishops,' the *Risposta* says, 'who in some way retained a Catholic feeling or a remnant

¹ The text of the *Risposta* is printed in Mr. Lacey's *Roman Diary*, pp. 210-239.

of veneration for the Catholic dogmas were driven from their sees under Edward. The bishops who retained their sees could in no way be called Catholics.' Yet of these, Godrich, Sampson, Kitchin, Thirlby, King, Chambers, Salcot, Wharton and Aldrich, who held their sees and administered their diocese throughout Edward's reign, continued to do so without question under Mary. Of these, Wharton was at once promoted to another see, and Thirlby was chosen as the most suitable ambassador to the Papal Court.

The statements in regard to the state of the English Church were not dissimilar, as, for example: 'The Thirty-nine Articles deny the doctrine of the Real Presence, and clearly teach the heresies of the Reformation period.' 'A more complete change than that made in England in regard to the liturgy and dogma could hardly be conceived.' 'The office recited by Anglicans [Mattins and Evensong] is completely different from the Divine Office of the Catholic Church. It is only a collection of Psalms and lessons from Holy Scripture, substituted by Cranmer for the Breviary.' Its recitation by the clergy is only a counsel of devotion and is neglected by the majority. The form of Absolution is declarative. 'It would be hardly possible to find one among the Anglican bishops who believes in the priesthood, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in the Real Presence.' Those who seem to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence teach it only in the Lutheran sense. 'The few' in England who 'use Catholic expressions' use those expressions, 'if they come to be examined, as other heretics do, in a heretical sense.' Before the Tractarian Revival in 1830 hardly any one amongst the Anglicans could be found who believed in the priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Mass, or the Real Presence, in any Catholic sense. Even to-day what the majority of the ritualists teach can with difficulty be reconciled with Catholic teaching. 'Down to 1830 there was not a single parish church or cathedral in all England where the Protestant doctrine was not publicly preached and where the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Real Presence was not rejected with outrage and contempt.' Cardinal Newman before his conversion discovered the

futility of any attempt to reconcile England and Rome, and after his conversion stated categorically the impossibility of any such reconciliation. In a published letter of the Cardinal's he states his judgment against Anglican Orders, and shows by 'unanswerable arguments how all the bishops and theologians of the Anglican Church for three centuries after Elizabeth denied absolutely the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession.' As no one, the *Risposta* went on to say, 'had shown himself, from his early childhood, more devoted to that sect,' his life shows most clearly 'the futility of Anglicanism in so far as it tries to masquerade under Catholic aspects.' It is asserted that the ordinary rule in England is for the Eucharist to be celebrated once a month, only in a few churches every Sunday. Resistance on the part of the Anglican bishops to the civil power is unheard of. 'They are created by the civil power, and they submissively obey their creator.' The civil power holds 'the supreme government of the Church.' The bishops on doing homage acknowledge they receive all jurisdiction 'in spiritual matters' from the crown.¹ In the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln, the Archbishop decided the case in an 'absolutely Protestant sense,' and the directions he gave were given 'expressly to maintain the fundamental principles of Luther, Calvin and Cranmer, that the sacraments bestow grace not *ex opere operato*, but as external signs of the Passion, which excite faith in the hearts of the assistants.'

The candour of such statements, the amount of truth and falsehood suggested by them will be best appreciated by those who know most of the history of the Church of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury's opinion of them will be seen later.

The *Risposta* concluded with a second part, dealing with the hope of reunion. 'What,' it began by asking, 'are the

¹ Abbot Gasquet might have remembered in regard to the oath of homage—together with much else which would have given a different complexion to his account of the Church of England—the well-known letter from Cardinal Wolsey, after his disgrace, to Bishop Gardiner, begging him to ask the King to allow him the 'spirituals' of Winchester for the support of himself and his household.

motives which connect reunion with the recognition of the validity of the Orders possessed by Anglicans? To all of us who live in England, and know the religious situation,' say the authors, 'these motives are clear. Down to the year 1830 there only existed in England the old school of Anglicanism. This desired nothing but an insular Church, national, and in everything conformed to the doctrine of the Reformation. . . . After 1830 arose Puseyism and Neo-Anglicanism, introduced by the Tractarians and ritualists. . . . These followed other roads, seeking to restore the worship and doctrine of the Anglican Church by degrees after the likeness of the Church of the East and West, maintaining, however, always unchanged, their independence of the Roman See. . . . Hence such efforts to arrogate to themselves everything to be found in the Catholic Church in the matter of worship, of practices and means of devotion, of sacred vestments, and of the ornamentation of the churches. In this way they have been able to deceive the people and hold back those sincere souls who were drawing near to the true Church. . . .

'This new situation is well defined by the recent words of a Catholic bishop of England.

'From the time of the Reformation the devil has constantly combated by means of heresy the Catholic faith in England, opposing it openly and violently. Not having obtained fully his intention, he has changed his tactics since that year, and combats the Catholic Church by imitating her, and by using against her a travesty of her doctrine, and usurping her practices, attracts simple souls. These tactics are more to be feared than the others, though we hope by the grace of God to thwart them.¹

'In these latter times Neo-Anglicanism, or ritualism, which more than ever, and with studied care, wishes to

¹ Cf. Cardinal Vaughan's speech at Preston: 'I know that it has been called Popery, or the Mass in masquerade—not without some reason. St. Jerome speaks of the devil as the *simia Dei*, the ape of God, so clever is he in counterfeiting the works and ordinances of God. Under the appearance of an angel of light he deceives many, especially those who are willing to be deceived.' The Cardinal asked a distinguished convert whether he thought the Catholic revival in the Church of England was really the work of God or of Satan.

arrogate to itself the name of Catholic, makes every effort to exclude from England the so-called usurpation of the Roman Pontiff. . . .

‘ In this way the Anglican Church will remain free and independent, preserving in peace all the rights conquered by the Reformation with its manifold heresies, and, without submitting itself to the obedience of the Roman Pontiff, will have in the eyes of all, the glory and the prestige of the name Catholic. . . .

‘ Who does not see that in order to succeed in these hopes and ambitions it is essential to obtain the recognition of Anglican Orders ? Without this the Eastern and Western Churches can never admit Anglicans to Communion. They have also need of it the better to combat the sects of their Dissenters. It is for this that they so much desire to obtain from the Holy See some sort of recognition of their Orders.

‘ With this object the Anglicans awaken a vague hope of the reunion so much desired by the paternal heart of the Holy Father, affirming that the recognition of their Orders would smooth the way for it. If this concession, supposing it possible, became a reality, Anglicans would certainly have a thousand dogmatic reasons for not uniting themselves with us. In this way Anglicanism would obtain its objects, and the hope of a union in the Catholic sense would vanish more than ever.

‘ But one may ask if really in the Anglican Church there is a movement or a disposition of minds for union with the Roman See. We answer : If the Roman Pontiff would consent to the abrogation of the degrees of the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican, or to explain them in a new and non-Catholic sense, or should declare that the simple primacy of honour, or one founded *De jure ecclesiastico*, sufficed for his ministry, or, in other words, if the Pontiff were to become Anglican, there is no doubt that many amongst the New Anglicans would unite themselves to the Church of Rome. But if the Roman Pontiff, as infallible custodian of the Catholic truth, refuses to make similar concessions, with the exception of those sincere souls, every day more numerous, who enter the bosom of the

Church, none amongst the Anglican bishops, few of the clergy, and very few of the laity would seek union in the Catholic sense. This would be an inconceivable aberration, they say, as does the Archbishop of Canterbury.

‘Who does not see that the same conclusion is to be deduced from the letter of the celebrated Mr. Gladstone to the Archbishop of York? In it, though enveloped in a multitude of words, the author has constantly before him the Anglican Church, independent, as an equal and integral part of the Church of Christ on a par with that of Greece and Rome. He invites the Roman Pontiff to unite himself to this triple federation, so that these three Churches may defend against unbelievers the dogma of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, and of Apostolic Succession. He would persuade the Pontiff to recognise a certain equality in these Churches, and to realise this dream he employs the language of a deferential adulation to obtain the recognition of Anglican Orders. The celebrated chief of English Liberalism sought to destroy the work of the Vatican Council under Pius IX., and now under Leo XIII., he would render it absolutely useless.

‘We can, therefore, assert that, apart from the good dispositions of sincere souls, this new attempt is nothing else but an insidious assault against the Roman Church. All the clergy and the whole of the Catholic population of England attest it, and the non-Catholic English themselves do not conceal it. Thus the great English paper, the *Times*, which represents more than any other the mind of the English people, wrote on 1st June 1896, that if the Roman Pontiff were to yield to the pretensions of Mr. Gladstone, he would admit that the Anglican Church is a true and integral part of the Church of Christ, and would place himself in antagonism to his predecessors. Here are the words of the *Times* :—

‘Mr. Gladstone does not say that we must recognise the Pope as the Supreme Head of the Church. It is the Pope who asserts that this constitutes the test *stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*, and that he will welcome us to the fold if we give him satisfaction on this point. We may be sure that if the Pope is persuaded

that a recognition by him of Anglican Orders will prepare the way to a recognition on our part of his pretensions, the way will be smoothed in some manner. But if this recognition does not come to pass, if the Anglican clergy and laity persist in their independence, the recognition of Anglican Orders will serve to weaken rather than to fortify the position of the Pope and of his Church. It would be equivalent to a confession that the Church of England is, and has always been, a real and living branch of the Catholic Church, and that its clergy possess these supernatural powers which Cardinal Vaughan has claimed as the exclusive property of his Church. This cannot be the intention of the Pope, but it is almost certain that this would be the consequence. It is sufficiently probable that a section of the High Church party would be disposed to accept fully the proposals of the Pope. But a larger and more judicious party would not do so at all. At the most a recognition by the Pope of Anglican Orders would serve to confirm them in the persuasion of the truth and security of their position, leaving the others as they are.—*Times*. 1st June 1896.¹

‘If we are asked if the actual situation in England gives us hope of a return to the bosom of the Church, we answer that, with the grace of God, this hope is already sufficiently great.

‘Throughout England conversions are numerous. The already large number of converts will increase without doubt, if it is made more evident that the Roman Catholic Church is the only one in England which has the right to the prerogatives and the name of Catholic. . . .

‘To attain this end, without sacrificing truth and justice, it is absolutely necessary to abstain from everything which may, even apparently, give approval and force to the pseudo-Catholic sect; or which may confirm in any way its authority. Otherwise, not only will historic and dogmatic truth be obscured, but the people of England will be deceived in regard to the Catholic Church, and the return of England to the faith will become impossible, or will be indefinitely retarded.

‘This is our testimony to the situation of the Church in

¹ For Archbishop Benson's estimate of the influences behind the *Times*, see note p. 355.

our country, and we conscientiously give it for the love of Christ, submitting it humbly to the consideration of His Vicar upon earth.'

Bishop of Peterborough (Rt. Rev. Mandell Creighton)
to Lord Halifax

THE PALACE, PETERBOROUGH,
 September 24, 1896.

Thank you for letting me see the enclosed.¹ It is not pleasant reading. It is exactly like a correspondence from the sixteenth century, and tells the same story. First a vague conception of a higher duty, then endless diplomacy; in its course expediency gradually creeps into the foremost place, the original point disappears, and the upshot is something as nearly as possible the reverse of what was originally intended. In fact the Roman Church is not primarily a Church, but a State. It is Erastian in the highest degree, because the State has absorbed it, and political considerations over-ride spiritual considerations habitually and universally. Well, you have done your duty, and have nothing to regret.

A day or two later, he wrote again:—

I am very glad that you and Portal are not discomfited, but feel that labours for a good cause carried on single-heartedly are never fruitless in the great future.

It is very difficult for an Englishman to understand Roman methods. There is a letter of Mgr. Talbot to Manning: 'You will have battles to fight, because every Englishman is naturally anti-Roman. To be a Roman is to an Englishman an effort. Dr. Newman is more English than the English, his spirit must be crushed.' The remark is profoundly true, and the method indicated is suggestive. It is not the extension of a spiritual kingdom, but the maintenance of earthly rule which prevails in the official utterances of Rome.

The production of Moyes and Gasquet² is unworthy: it is purely political, and founded on nothing but temporary expediency. It is the *Tablet* over again.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, writing to me from Ireland a fortnight before his death, expressed himself in similar terms to the Bishop of Peterborough. 'I am extremely

¹ Some of the correspondence and memoranda contained in this volume.

² The *Risposta*.

obliged to you,' he said, 'for sending me the Memorandum of your correspondence, and for the Italian document, *Risposta all'Opuscolo intitulado De Re Anglicana*. I can scarcely understand how so shameless a document as the latter can have been put out and accepted.'

On the 28th September, Cardinal Vaughan, speaking at Hanley of the decision of the Pope, which he described as a solemn decision, declaring Anglican Orders 'null and void,' drew attention to the fact that 'interest in the decision was limited to an extremely small minority of the English people, and even to a minority amongst Anglicans.' 'The great mass of the Church of England which is Erastian and Latitudinarian,' was, he said, 'in no way affected by the declaration that the Anglican Ordinal confers no power to offer sacrifices and to forgive sins.' . . . 'The limited number whom it did touch have known enough of Cranmer to dread the results of his handiwork.' 'They know the Erastian and Protestant Church of England as a body rejects all idea of a real sacrificing priesthood.' . . . 'It was not surprising that they should have had a deep and reasonable anxiety as to the validity of their Orders.' . . . 'No effort and skill were spared by them to convince the Holy See of the validity of those Orders.' . . . 'They now find themselves 'shivering in their insular isolation,' condemned by the Catholic Church, disowned within their own communion,' 'as well as by the immense majority of the English people.' . . . How can they continue to 'trust in a sacramental system condemned as null and void by the Catholic Church.' 'The close of the controversy,' the Cardinal added, 'for those who face reality . . . will usher in a period of grace and conversion.' The Pope, in language of the deepest sympathy, exhorts them to obey the Divine call. Nay, more, 'the Holy Father has shown his gracious sympathy in a still more practical way.' 'We cannot,' the Pope says, in a letter addressed to myself, 'without the deepest emotion contemplate the very painful condition of converted Anglican clergymen, who, in prompt obedience to the call of divine grace, have entered into the Catholic Church, . . . we would wish, therefore, to come

to the aid of those who have taken this step,' . . . [by the formation in England of a fund for the help of converted Anglican clergymen] . . . 'which should secure for them the means of providing for their most urgent needs during the first five years after their conversion.'

The address concluded by the mention of the formation of a great Association of Prayer for England in France, and by urging those 'who piously desire reunion with Rome no longer to temporise with grace.' . . . 'Tarry not for corporate reunion ; it is a dream and a snare of the evil one.'

Writing to the Abbé in reference to the Cardinal's speech, I said :—

Il est impossible d'exagérer l'effet déplorable qu'a produit la Bulle. Ceux qui ont été les plus intéressés à l'œuvre ne pardonneront jamais au Pape ce qu'il a fait. Et le cardinal, d'après sa coutume, a réussi à empirer encore la situation. Quand on vous donne un soufflet, ce n'est pas dans les habitudes de l'accepter sans rien dire, et quand on nous affirme que nos Sacrements sont nuls, que nos absolutions sont des jeux, et que tout ce qui s'est fait dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre depuis le réveil produit par le mouvement d'Oxford, est l'œuvre de Satan, vous comprenez qu'on se ferait brûler avec plaisir plutôt que de faire un autre pas vers Rome.

Remarquez ce que dit le cardinal pour les prières. La lettre du Pape au cardinal me fait bondir !

Les évêques enverront une réponse à la Bulle. L'évêque de Peterborough s'en occupe.

J'ai écrit au cardinal Vaughan, mais certainement je n'irai pas le voir.¹

Je lui ai dit très simplement que bien que j'aie une vraie affection pour lui personnellement, je croyais que l'histoire dirait de lui et de son entourage qu'ils avaient empêché une œuvre chrétienne de se réaliser.

Je continue ma lettre d'hier.

C'est encore une grosse faute que le cardinal a commise. Son discours, et la lettre du Pape promettant des secours à tout prêtre qui se soumet, produit l'impression que la décision sur les Ordres est une manœuvre pour attirer des conversions. Vous pouvez comprendre de quel œil on regarde un tel procédé. Toute la sympathie qu'on avait pour Léon XIII. a disparu d'un

¹ He had suggested seeing me.

coup. Il nous dirait à ce moment les choses les plus aimables qu'on ne lui répondrait pas. Il faut bien le dire, nous avions, tout le monde en convient, réussi d'une manière vraiment merveilleuse, à créer un désir d'union. Le rapprochement vers Rome, même après l'Encyclique, était très grand, tout était bien préparé. Le Pape avait le jeu, pour ainsi dire, dans ses mains. On était sûr d'avoir des conférences, etc., etc. Les bonnes dispositions de l'archevêque d'York grandissaient. Une démarche du Pape l'année prochaine pouvait tout enlever, et maintenant, c'est fini. La lettre apostolique a tout coupé. Les personnes qui disent le moins sont celles peut-être qui sentent le plus. 'Tout ce qu'on disait de Rome est justifié,' voilà la phrase, et comme je vous le disais hier, le discours du cardinal que je vous ai envoyé a fini par exaspérer tout le monde. Ce qui me fait le plus de peine c'est que je ne puis pas excuser LÉON XIII. Il a commencé par vouloir une chose, il a fini par la rendre impossible. C'est sa politique à lui qu'il a brisée de ses propres mains.¹ Je crois que ce n'est pas à nous qu'il a fait le plus de mal, et je me demande si à la longue la lettre apostolique ne suscitera pas de grandes difficultés pour l'Eglise romaine elle-même.

Je dois parler à un Meeting du Church Union à Shrewsbury lundi prochain, et je crains beaucoup, mon cher ami, que vous ne soyez pas content de ce que je dirai. Il faut dire, et il faut le dire très nettement, que la Bulle nous laisse plus déterminés que jamais à défendre nos Ordres, nos Sacrements et notre Eglise, et que nous osons nous servir des principes énoncés par l'Encyclique *Satis Cognitum*, pour dire au successeur de Saint Pierre ce que disait St. Paul à St. Pierre lui-même, que dans cette affaire il s'est écarté de la vérité et de la justice. Il ne faut pas qu'on se fasse illusion à Rome. On ne répond pas à des pierres qu'on nous a jetées à la tête par des confetti, et il faut qu'on se résigne à entendre bien des choses auxquelles on est peu accoutumé. C'est malheureux, mais c'est ainsi.

J'ai reçu une longue lettre de l'archevêque de Canterbury. Je prévois que la réponse de nos évêques, qu'on ne fera pas à la hâte, ne plaira pas à Rome. C'est toute une tempête qu'on a soulevée ici.

Je vous prie de remarquer que le cardinal, dans son discours, dit tout carrément que la réunion en corps est un piège de Satan !

¹ 'Des inspirations de génie qui n'aboutissaient pas,' was the criticism passed on Leo XIII. at a later date. See letter, p. 429.

Lord Halifax to H. E. Cardinal Vaughan

I am touched by your Eminence writing to me as you have, and am grateful for it. There are things which it is unusual to say, but I shall attempt them nevertheless. I have a great regard and affection for your Eminence, and I like to say so because your Eminence compels me to fight, instead of, as I had hoped and prayed, helping us to peace. Thank God, gentlemen can fight and be friends, that they can do so is a great happiness, and your Eminence will see that despite everything I feel your Eminence to be my friend by my sending you the letter¹ I wrote to the Abbé Portal when I got his letter announcing the Bull. Your Eminence will see from it that above all things I want to be loyal and true, for indeed I could not bear to say behind your Eminence's back what I did not say to your face.

A day or two later I heard again from the Cardinal, who thanked me for my letter and for sending him a copy of what I had written to the Abbé Portal

He said, 'I believe the time will come when you will judge things differently . . . I should have thought, from the point of view of piety and devotion to our Lord, you and I ought to rejoice to think that men have not had the power to profane and dishonour our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist during the last three centuries which they would have had were their Orders valid. Think of how shocking it would be if men were actually producing our Lord, not to be honoured and adored, but in truth to be disowned and dishonoured by themselves and the people.'

The Cardinal had, on former occasions, asserted that reunion turned on the recognition of a Divine Teacher; this Divine Teacher he had identified with the Pope, the visible head of the Church on earth, who had been invested with power by the Divine Founder of the Church, to teach, define, settle controversies, and govern. He had, in consequence, refused to take any steps which might have inclined Englishmen to reconsider their traditional attitude towards the Holy See. He now showed again how little he understood the way to soften differences and avoid

¹ See letter of 21st September, p. 357.

misunderstandings by the use of so unhappy an expression as that of 'producing our Lord': it was useless, however, to insist on such considerations, the time for insisting upon them was yet to come.

A day or two later I sent the Abbé what I had been saying in regard to the Papal Bull at Shrewsbury, where the Church Congress was then sitting, adding :—

Je crois fermement que l'œuvre s'accomplira un jour, peut-être que tout ce qui arrive va l'aider d'une manière tout à fait imprévue, mais pour le moment Léon XIII. a commis la plus grande faute qui lui fût possible. Il avait fait beaucoup espérer, et c'est lui qui a permis que tout fût renversé. L'effet de la Bulle est justement le contraire de ce que le cardinal Vaughan désirait.

It is not necessary for the purposes of this narrative to give more than extracts from the correspondence which ensued on the publication of the Bull, but some notes written by Archbishop Benson very shortly before his death, sent to the *Times* by Arthur C. Benson, and reproduced in the *Church Times* of 23rd October 1896, together with one letter from the Rev. F. Paget, Dean of Christ Church (afterwards Bishop of Oxford), and one from the Rev. William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, must be given.

The subject of Orders, as needful to a perfectly constituted Church, has been as jealously scrutinised in England as by Rome, and with much more knowledge of facts. . . . The result of scrutiny with that fuller knowledge was, and is, to establish that our Holy Orders are identical with those of the whole Catholic Church. They are in origin, continuity, matter, form, intention, and all that belongs to them, identical accordingly with those of the Church of Rome.

The Dean of Christ Church wrote :—

I have been often thinking of you during the last few days ; and I must venture to write a few lines, sincerely trusting that you will not acknowledge them in any way—to tell you of my great sorrow for the pain which must have come on

you with the announcement of this decision at Rome. You have made a great venture for the sake of charity and truth, and you have spared nothing for the hope that was before you. Men cannot so venture, the world being what it is, without the risk of cruel and deep pain. But the world is made better by those who, facing that risk, are charitable, and trust and hope; and no great end, I suppose, is ever brought nearer save through pain—whether it be of soldiers, or of those who think and toil and pray for some blessing, not knowing that its time is not yet. And delay is not denial: it may be God's way of giving more than we know how to ask—if our desires would hurry His bounty, they would also narrow it. And, anyhow, what we have to do in our few years here is to try to make the outcome of our life such that in due time and place He may find some use for it, and we shall not fail of that so long as charity is in us.

The Rev. Dr. William Bright wrote:—

I have felt deeply for you on the grievous disappointment of hopes which the Papal Bull must have caused. They were hopes, I must confess, in which I could not persuade myself to share. I felt all along that it would require a sort of miracle to make Rome decide otherwise than she has done. But that is not to the purpose now. My reason for writing is that I have realised as at first I had not (probably you had seen the point more clearly), the singular disingenuousness of the argument which Leo XIII. has, unhappily for his own credit, been persuaded to adopt and use. Notably—he professes to ‘adhere strictly to the decisions of his predecessors.’ Among these he dwells on the letters of Julius III. and Paul IV. Now let us grant (I don't think Anglicans have always granted as they should) that these Popes did mean that ordination of priests or bishops in which ‘the accustomed form of the Church has not been observed’ (*servata*) were as such invalid. Surely they were here relying on the notorious declaration of Eugenius IV. in 1439 as to the (matter and) form of priestly ordination.¹ That declaration is, of course, suicidal in its effect on all the old Western ordinations of priests for, say, eleven centuries. No respectable Roman theologian would now think of disputing it. Yet it is, as far as one can see, the foundation stone (so far as

¹ See letter of the Abbé Duchesne to the Abbé Portal as to Eugenius IV. and the Scholastics, p. 78.

priesthood is concerned) of the two sixteenth-century Popes' decision, which cannot but therefore be invalidated by its unsoundness. Yet Leo never refers to that unfortunate decision, except in the darkly-worded clause, that 'so far as in this case he has to consider it, the matter of Orders is imposition of hands.' (He adds that the omission of the *traditio instrumentorum* would, by custom, be made good by a hypothetical re-ordination.) Again he says that *we* have commonly held the 'form' to consist in the four words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost' separated from the immediate context. Of course we have not. The objection that the additions 'for the office and work of a priest' or 'of a bishop' made in 1661-2, implied that the words as they formerly were, were inadequate, is both false and absurd. Inadequate in such a connection 'spells' invalid, and thus he charges the Caroline Revisers with thinking to cure the invalidity of their own ordinations by prescribing for the future the use of a fuller form! He does not know, one supposes, what we all know here, that the addition was made to bar out a presbyterianising inference, by accentuating the difference between episcopate and priesthood.

But the most salient flaw, it seems to me, in the whole document is its deliberate indefiniteness just where precision of language was a duty. The Pope does not tell us outright that 'Receive power to offer sacrifice,' is *the* 'form'; in fact he dares not. But neither does he tell us what is, or what would content him. He talks about *Sacerdotium* without defining the 'content' of the term as he uses it. He declaims (it is nothing short of declamation) about the 'adulteration and denial' (in the Edwardine Ordinal) 'of the Sacrament of Order.' This, it appears, consists in the (deliberate) omission of any recognition of the priestly power to offer up the true Body and Blood. In this, he says, 'consists chiefly the grace and power of the priesthood.' This 'chiefly' seems virtually to mean 'only,' for the omission in question is presently described as a 'removal of whatever in the Catholic Rite sets forth the dignity and office of priesthood.' Here one observes that whereas both the Tridentine Decrees and the *Catechismus ad Parochos* insert language intended to qualify, limit, and thus justify such expressions as 'offering of the Body and Blood' (whether the language in question suffices for this, is another question) the Pope (shall we say 'deliberately'?) omits all such qualifications, and uses the crude *unlimited* phrase which has caused so much

controversy, and is at any rate open to such grave objection. If he himself attaches a more moderate sense to it, he certainly does not tell us so ; he must know that various senses have been put on such phrases, but he does not say which he adopts. Then he says that the intention manifest in the Edwardine Ordinal, is 'to reject what the Church does in ordaining, and what by Christ's institution belongs to the essence of the Sacrament.' Anyhow, this is a very large statement as to an Ordinal which purposes to perpetuate the three Orders, and repeatedly describes them as such ; and a charge so serious ought to be sustained by complete elucidation (the rather that his own Canon of the Mass contains no verbal oblation of the Body and Blood, and even places the Host and Cup after adoration on a level with Abel's firstlings and Melchisedech's bread and wine ; so that he himself lives in a house over-full of glass windows). But what strikes me most is, that until this vagueness is removed, the Papal argument has no claim to consideration ; it bears sophistry on its face.

The Rev. E. Denny, one of the authors of the *De Hierarchia*, writing at the same time, expressed similar opinions to those of Dr. Bright :—

The Bull was not to me a surprise, I have always feared that the power of the *Curia*, especially when stirred up by our Roman friends at home, would prove too strong for the good intentions even of a Pope such as Leo XIII., and I felt that the ground which would be probably taken would be to allege that the existing practice was based upon a decision behind which the Roman authorities would not go.

It is a great gain to have the reason for an adverse decision so plainly set out, for reasons can be shown to be invalid, and that those on which the decision is based are so, seems to me self-evident to any one who knows anything of the subject. In the future, in God's time, this may open the way to others, whose efforts to obtain justice for the English Church in this matter may be more successful, and so Reunion may be laboured for with more prospect of success.

I grieve on the new obstacle raised in the path of reunion by the Bull—the ways of God are indeed mysterious—but I doubt not that His Will will be accomplished in this matter as in all others. One thing I think we may be legitimately thank-

ful for, was that the cause of the breaking off of the negotiations on this point was not one raised by English Church authorities, and I do not believe that your efforts and those of others who have laboured with you will ultimately be found to be all in vain.

On the 13th October the news arrived of the sudden death of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Hawarden, whilst on a visit to Mr. Gladstone, and I wrote to the Abbé saying :—

La nouvelle de la mort de l'archevêque de Canterbury nous est arrivée hier au soir ; je ne puis penser à autre chose. Qui va lui succéder ? Je crois qu'il n'est pas impossible que ce soit l'évêque de Peterborough.

Le cardinal Vaughan m'envoie cet article¹ pour me faire comprendre que même mes amis en France nous abandonnent. Il ne voit pas plus clair qu'un hibou en plein jour.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward to Lord Halifax

MOLESCROFT, EASTBOURNE,
October 17, 1896.

It seems strange after all our letters not to interchange any ideas on what has been happening. . . .

With regard to the substance of the Bull, I think your people are mistaken in supposing that it was a matter of policy in which Moyes and Gasquet determined the line to be taken—indeed, I am sure it was not so. I know through two people, both of whom were on the Commission, that Cardinal Mazzella took the strongest view from the first that the Orders were invalid, and the Pope trusts him implicitly. No doubt as to the policy of issuing the Bull, Cardinal Vaughan and Moyes and Gasquet did their best. The Cardinal makes no secret of this. It has always seemed to me that if we want to find common ground the Orders is the last question for discussion. It depends really on our respective view of the rightful position of Rome and the action of the Church of England at the Reformation.² . . .

¹ The article of M. Tavernier after the meeting in London at the end of July at which the Abbé had spoken, and which had been so misrepresented.

² This opinion as to the Orders question was developed in a letter from Mr. Ward to the *Guardian* two years earlier. See *Guardian* of 12th December 1894.

And now for the future. I don't see what possible good can be done—if reunion of any kind is the object, and not simply vindicating the position your Church has adopted—by going on with a controversy about Anglican Orders. The Pope's decision is quite final. It would merely mean a wrangle without hope of agreement. . . . I do not see hope of any good being done at present in the direction of clearing of issues, etc. So long as the Orders question occupies attention, we are at an *impasse*. You may prove your Orders by taking up a position which Rome finally condemned at the Reformation, but how can we take up such a position. As Abbé Loisy¹ writes to Hügel, the discussion on that question is at an end. If no other position will help to an understanding then it must stop altogether. But in that case one is driven to the conclusion that the discussion never had from the beginning any bearing on reunion in any shape. None of our people ever thought that a reunion on the basis of recognition of Anglican Orders was possible, Duchesne certainly did not. . . .

I have written rather *currente calamo*, and I feel that what I have said comes to very little. But my feeling is not a bright one for the hopes you used once to discuss. I am driven back to the fact that not many among you really wish for reunion with Rome, though many take Rome seriously enough to be very angry with the Bull. This is the very worst possible position for mutual understanding, and it seems to me an illogical position. If Rome's judgment has the importance they attach to it, they ought to feel her *prima facie* claims, and to long for reunion. But if they are satisfied that an independent National Church is the normal thing, why should they be so angry because Rome condemns their independent proceedings in tampering with the Liturgy at the Reformation, and decides that the implied condemnation of the full Roman view of the priesthood vitiates the new formula. I hope six months hence feelings may be calmer and discussion may again be profitable. I am not sorry that my *Life of Cardinal Wiseman* will not be ready before about that time. I have there endeavoured to express the issues clearly, and, I hope, fairly to both sides. I wish I could write a more useful and pleasanter letter, but I feel nothing but irritation to be in the air. And I can't yet see what will be the most promising or useful discussion in the future.

¹ Since excommunicated for his writings on Biblical criticism, etc.

PS.—I forgot in my letter the one practical thing I had to say : that I am preparing a Memorandum on the view of the whole matter which I take. If I can get it influentially placed before the Roman authorities, so much the better. Anyhow, I shall print it, and will send you a copy. It is simply absurd to suppose that the tone of Moyes's document and articles is that of all educated Catholics in England, or that they take the same view of the wisest policy to be pursued.

Of course if I get it to Rome, it will be in the name of others as well. The point would be to show the view of a considerable group.

In thanking Mr. Ward for his letter I told him that I, too, had been thinking much of him, and should have written, but that I really did not know what to say. His letter, however, suggested certain observations.

'I agree with you,' I went on, 'in thinking it a mistake to suppose the *substance* of the Bull the result merely of a question of policy. I feel sure the Pope personally, when he entered into the discussion, wished for a solution which might promote friendly relations, and that he imagined it easier than proved to be the case to arrive at such a solution.' . . . 'When it was discovered that a favourable solution, even for the doubt, meant reversing the decision of Clement XI., it was felt to be too big an affair to undertake,' especially in face of all that was urged by Cardinal Vaughan as to the impossibility of reunion, the 'desire to repudiate the doctrine of Sacrifice by the Compilers of the Ordinal asserted by Gasquet and Moyes, and all the consequences which Abbot Gasquet, Canon Moyes and the Cardinal declared would follow from a change on the part of Rome on such a question.' That the decisions of the Popes of the sixteenth century, and that of Clement XI., might have been got over from the Roman point of view, if there had been a desire to do so, I was convinced, but I quite understood 'the magnitude of the task, and that the Pope should have shrunk from it was not surprising.' 'It is just here where the question of policy comes in. When two courses are possible, what seems likely to lead to the best results must decide which is taken, and if it were

represented to the Pope that all he could expect from embarking on so great, and, so to speak, unprecedented, a course, was to strengthen England as against Rome, and to hinder individual conversions, what was he likely to do, but what he did? ' Apart from the considerations brought forward by Father Puller in his Articles on the Sacrifice of the Mass, which I had reason to believe had been entirely neglected, if indeed they had been mentioned at all, it was obvious how likely, I might say certain, the statements made by Abbot Gasquet and Canon Moyes in their *Risposta* were to mislead those who were not conversant with the ins-and-outs of our history. ' That Thirlby of Ely should have retained his bishopric all through Edward's reign is a fact which cannot be got over. But I do not want to argue: what I want to clear up is the exact meaning of the phrases in your letter—the validity of the Orders "depends really on our respective views of the rightful position of Rome and the action of the Church of England at the Reformation," . . . , "the whole thing turns on what is really meant by the Catholic Church." "You may prove your Orders by taking up a position which Rome finally condemned at the Reformation." "Because Rome condemns independent proceedings in tampering with the Liturgy at the Reformation, and decides that the implied condemnation of the full Roman view of the priesthood vitiates the new formula."

' Does all this mean that the real fault with our Ordinal is that it was set up in disobedience and revolt, plus the assumed defective intention of its compilers in regard to the Sacrifice? If so, it seems to me that the defect in the Ordinal is not so much one of form and intention as of authority,¹ and that if what your last letter seems to imply is true, null and void in the Bull do not mean null and void as we understand those words in England. If so, the question of the assumed defects of

¹ Cf. 'The one thing wanting in the eyes of the Roman Catholic was the papal approbation; with this all other defects would have been cured; without it all other completeness of detail was absolutely null.' *Second Visitation Charge of Rt. Rev. William Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, April and May 1893.* (*Visitation Charges*, published 1904.)

form and intention fall into a secondary place, and they are not the real determining causes of the Bull. What is the position Rome finally condemned at the Reformation? And how can the rightful position of Rome and the general action of England in the sixteenth century, unless this question of authority be the real crux, determine the character of the form and the intention of our Ordinal?

‘Again you say: “I can’t see any more offence in the Pope denying your Orders than in your denying his claims.” I see all the difference in the world. We have never, we do not now, deny the Primacy, the question merely is, what is the extent of the powers which our Lord’s words confer, and the Church has understood to be conferred on St. Peter and his successors.

‘By the present Bull the Pope declares that we have neither Orders nor Sacraments: the difference is vital and profound.

‘Again, you say that you are driven back to the belief that there is no real desire for reunion, etc., and that if an independent National Church is the normal state of things, etc.

‘But the strength of the desire for a recognition of our orders is the exact measure of the strength of the desire for reunion. The recognition had been ardently hoped for, because without it reunion is impossible; with it, though such recognition would not directly make reunion any nearer, indirectly it made it not only possible, but comparatively easy.

‘Your whole letter implies that men’s hearts must be won before their heads—it is just because a recognition of our orders would have won men’s hearts as nothing else would, that it was so essential a step in the way of peace. Men had begun to consider the possibility of accepting claims on the part of Rome which two years ago would have been thought impossible, but the Cardinal’s incapacity to understand us, his utterly mistaken views of our position and the conduct he has pursued in consequence, has undone all that had been effected, and produced an irritation which, as you justly say, it will take a long time to get over.

‘Corporate reunion, except on the basis of a recognition of our Orders, is impossible. Their recognition would not have involved union, certainly not, but it would have enabled us to go on and discuss other questions, and disposed every one to enter upon such a discussion with a desire of coming to an agreement. Whether Rome could have given sufficient explanations of her claims to Supremacy, Jurisdiction and Infallibility to have made union possible is another question. I believe she could, and my whole object has been to get other people to see this also. In any case we were ready to discuss the question ; and the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, in the basis which it claimed for the rights of the Holy See, took ground common to us both.

‘Now it is the Pope who has barred the way of discussion, and by the wounded feelings which have been created, he has done the precise thing which, humanly speaking, even if discussions could be still had, prejudices the chances of any good result being arrived at. It is not we who hang back from efforts for peace, but he who has destroyed the basis which we have all along pointed out to be the only basis on which anything practical in the direction of corporate reunion could be attempted. No one has a right to charge us with having had no real wish for reunion.

‘How any one can imagine that what the Church of England did at the Reformation was “an implied condemnation of the full Roman view of the priesthood,” I do not understand. The full Roman view of the priesthood does not, I suppose, go beyond the views held by such writers as Thomassinus, Bossuet, Vasquez. Will any one say that the Church of England by any corporate action has condemned explicitly or implicitly views like theirs ? I cannot see any basis for such an assertion, but from your letter, it is this “implied condemnation” which “vitiates the new formula.” If that is really the true account of the recent decision, I think we have a right to be angry, for the decision is based on a figment, and a figment for which the Cardinal’s representatives, Moyes and Gasquet, are responsible.

‘Speaking generally, and on another point—though a kindred one—the Reformers in England certainly desired

one thing : viz. to insist only in doctrine and practice upon what could certainly claim primitive sanction, and to allow a great latitude outside this. Granting this desire, and admitting that there was much at the time to create and to justify such a desire, is it not wiser in the interests of Christendom at large, whatever mistakes may have been made in fact, to go all possible lengths in the way of putting a favourable construction on what was then done, rather than to adopt precisely the opposite course ? ’

CHAPTER XV

AFTER THOUGHTS—HOPES FOR THE FUTURE

I HAVE said that I desire the foregoing correspondence to speak for itself. Some remarks, however, suggest themselves in regard to the matters dealt with in it, and to others which are inseparable from them.

It will be obvious, I think, that, with some few exceptions, the Roman Catholics in England, for various reasons, were indifferent, if not actively opposed, to any attempt at reunion. The biographer of Cardinal Vaughan says that he 'regarded the movement at first with impatience, and later with unconcealed dislike.'¹ The reasons for this attitude are not far to seek. As a rule, English Roman Catholics knew little of the inner life of the Church of England, nor were they disposed to regard such parts of its history as they were acquainted with in a favourable light. They had been accustomed to view the Church of England only on its Protestant side, and they could conceive no other. They were willing to live on friendly terms with members of the Church of England, indeed, they desired to do so, but on condition that the Church of England made no claim which might seem to conflict with the exclusive position they asserted for themselves. For the most part they were entirely ignorant of what might be alleged on behalf of such a position as was claimed for the Church of England by the Caroline divines, and later by such men as Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and the representatives of the Oxford Movement, and any attempt to put forward such a claim was viewed by most of them with irritation and dislike. It was an additional source

¹ *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 142.

of irritation that such a claim should be endorsed by foreigners. In addition to that irritation was the apprehension that to raise such questions at all might lead to inconvenience to themselves.¹ To allow the validity of English Orders was to admit that the practice of the Roman Church for more than three hundred years had been mistaken, and to that extent it was to belie their own past: to deny their validity was to risk offending many with whom they desired to be on good terms, and might even promote an anti-Catholic agitation amongst those who were comparatively indifferent to the question itself. What could be the object, they asked, of raising a question which in itself had at best only a very indirect and remote bearing on the question of reunion—a question which they did not believe to be a practical one, but which might well disturb the peace they enjoyed, and might embitter their relations with the mass of Englishmen.² Now, whatever else may be said about such considerations, it can hardly be denied that they were purely human; to rely on them was to ignore all those higher motives which lead men to embrace the cause of reunion, and to further any attempt which has reunion for its object. Was such an attitude consistent with the inspirations of faith, hope, and charity? Did it encourage those ventures of faith which are the informing power of all great movements? It was true that the difficulties in the way of reunion were immense, that prejudice in England against Rome was strong and deep-rooted, that the recognition of the validity of English Orders in no way directly affected the question of the rights of Rome, or the duty of England to acknowledge those rights. But it was certainly no less true that if the

¹ 'A controversy which can do no good, and may possibly do much harm.'—Abbot Gasquet, *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 59. This book and the *Life of Cardinal Vaughan* abundantly illustrate what is said above.

² This is witnessed to by Dom Gasquet in his *Leaves from My Diary*, where it is stated that the 'question, however it might interest those who were not members of the Church, was entirely a domestic one' to the Roman Church, and by his anxiety to show, when the condemnation came, that Anglican Orders were only denied in the Roman sense.—*Leaves from My Diary*, p. 47. See also Cardinal Vaughan's Addresses at Preston, Bristol, Hanley, etc.

object pre-eminently to be desired was to overcome that prejudice, and to induce Englishmen to consider the question of an approach to Rome, nothing was so likely to bring about such a result as a sympathetic attitude on the part of Rome in regard to a subject in which the pride of Englishmen and their loyalty to the National Church—I may add their Catholic instincts, even if unconsciously held—were deeply concerned. A discussion on Anglican Orders was a means, not an end, and it was just this that the Roman Catholic authorities in England refused to perceive. The narrow view they took of the Church of England may be thought to justify their action, but then they were responsible for the narrowness of that view, and to that extent for the consequences to which it led.

No one, certainly neither the Abbé Portal nor myself, supposed that such reunion was an immediate possibility. No one, least of all the Abbé and I, who for so long had discussed the matter in all its bearings, ignored the fact that those who shared my opinions on the subject of reunion with Rome were but a small minority in comparison with the much larger number who were in general accord with my objects and the principles of the Oxford Movement. What the Abbé and I maintained, as the correspondence shows, was that great movements were generally the result of determined action on the part of resolute minorities, and that the whole question of reunion resolved itself into this: Could we, or could we not, out of the elements actually existing within the Church of England, and with the forces at our disposal, create a movement in favour of reunion with the Holy See of real importance, and of such a character as might lead to definite results within a given time?

Mr. Wilfrid Ward, as his letters show, though he sympathised with the object in view, and was not unprepared to support it, was hesitating and doubtful as to what was possible. Cardinal Vaughan, and those who acted with him, had neither hesitations nor doubts. Corporate reunion was in their eyes a mischievous dream, the attempt to promote it a snare and a disaster, and the better to

ensure the failure of what was being attempted, they omitted nothing which might help to strangle it at its birth. The Cardinal and his friends were active in their antagonism; those who might have neutralised that antagonism, stood by and did nothing to support the endeavour that was being made in England and France to promote the cause of reunion. The course of events proved, as is shown by the correspondence, that the Abbé Portal and I were right in our estimate of the situation. Despite all the difficulties in our way, the attempt to create a movement of real importance in the interests of reunion with Rome was successful, and there can be little doubt that if so much was possible in spite of those difficulties, much more might have been affected, resulting in far-reaching steps towards the realisation of that reunion of Christendom which all professed to desire, had we met with the assistance from Cardinal Vaughan and his entourage we might naturally have expected, and secured the more determined support of those who, sympathising with the movement, and possessing a more accurate knowledge of the Church of England than prevailed at Rome, were in a position to have made their voices heard at the Vatican.

I say it with regret: the whole of Cardinal Vaughan's conduct, as I think the correspondence makes sufficiently clear, was unworthy of him; and it is no less painful to have to admit that what is true of Cardinal Vaughan is true in its degree of Archbishop Benson. The Archbishop was not insensible to the greatness of his own position. He was the successor of St. Augustine and Theodore, of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, Langton, Chicheley, and all the long line of saints and archbishops whose lives had shed glory on the See of Canterbury. The '*alterius orbis Papa*' was no empty phrase in his ears. He knew what England, in common with the whole of Christendom, owed to Rome in the past. If he was constrained, in common not only with the East but with great names in the West, to protest against the concentration of all the powers of the Church in the hands of the Roman Pontiffs, he could not deny to the Holy See the possession of such a

position in regard to Christendom at large, and the exercise of such an authority, as had been acknowledged by St. Cyprian and St. Augustine. Was it for him to take notice of the fact that one in the place of Cardinal Vaughan ignored his claims? The Pope himself, on the assurance that the overtures he was prepared to make would not be rejected, was ready to communicate with him in the interests of Christendom at large, and to seek his aid and co-operation in an attempt to put an end to the schism which had divided Rome and England since the sixteenth century. What doubt was possible as to his duty, or as to the course to be pursued in face of such an invitation? Faith, Hope, Charity, all the inspirations that prompt to great and decisive action called upon the Archbishop, to say in a few burning words how earnestly he desired the reunion of Christendom, how ready he was to do all in his power to heal the schism of the sixteenth century, what heartfelt thanks he returned to Almighty God for giving him the opportunity of co-operating with the Holy Father in such an endeavour, how earnestly he implored the Divine blessing on such an enterprise, and with what profound thankfulness he, too, would say his *Nunc dimittis*, if he should be enabled to promote the restoration of the relations that ought to exist between England and the Holy See, and to help forward the reunion of Christ's flock. What possible hesitation could exist as to the immediate duty of such answer? who was there in the whole world who would not have welcomed and applauded such a response to the overtures of Leo XIII.?

Instead of such a reply what was the Archbishop's answer? It was characterised by hesitations as unjust to himself as they were to the Church he represented—hesitations which were not only inconsistent with his own position, but which endorsed the claims and furthered, as nothing else could have furthered, the objects of Cardinal Vaughan. Few men have ever had so great an opportunity offered to them as the Archbishop; no man, I think, ever so completely threw it away. On Cardinal Vaughan's shoulders rests the chief responsibility for the failure of all that was attempted,

but a share of that responsibility must also rest on the shoulders of Archbishop Benson.

In regard to the matter and contents of the correspondence, it can hardly be doubted that Leo XIII.'s wish and intention, without prejudicing the result of any subsequent inquiry such as might have emerged from the conferences contemplated in the interests of reunion between representatives of both sides, had been to allow the ordination of members of the English clergy who were led to make their submission to Rome *sub conditione*.¹ The Abbé Duchesne, whose intervention in favour of the validity of English Ordinations had been welcomed by the Pope, had also desired that the question of baptisms should be regulated at the same time, and had expressed the opinion that it was impossible to defend the practice of making difficulties about baptisms administered by such men as the clergy of the Church of England, and by such a rite as that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, when none were made in regard to the baptisms administered by the clergy of the Nestorian or Abyssinian Churches. It was, no doubt, in consequence of this desire that the Pope had been unwilling to refer the matter of English Ordinations to the Holy Office.² The fear of such independent

¹ Cf. 'With regard especially to the question of Anglican Orders, the Pope went on to say: "If indeed they really seem to be doubtful, for his part, he was disposed to grant that they (the Anglicans who submitted to the authority of the Church) should be allowed to receive Ordination *sub conditione*, as in the case of a doubtful baptism "'—*Leaves from My Diary*, by Abbot Gasquet, pp. 7, 8.

² Cf. 'Cardinal Vaughan then spoke of what the Pope had said in regard to Anglican Orders. He said he did not quite understand the ground of the Pope's desire to change the existing practice of regarding them as absolutely invalid.'—*Ibid.*, p. 11.

And, 'Saw Cardinal Vaughan. . . . He had had a talk with Cardinal Mazzella the evening before, and found that, three months previously, Cardinal Mazzella had been spoken to by the Holy Father as to the question of Anglican Orders. He, the Cardinal, had urged the Pope to take no step without consultation.'—*Ibid.*, p. 13.

And again, 'This afternoon I went to see Cardinal Vaughan in response to a message from him. I found him disturbed in mind about this unfortunate Anglican Orders question. He had been informed that there was now under consideration the formation of a secret commission to consider the question. On this commission there was to be no Cardinal at all, and it was to report directly to the Pope. The Roman Cardinal who had originally told him about this had expressed great anxiety, and had said that at first it had been intended to put the matter into the

action on the part of the Pope led Cardinal Vaughan to press for the inquiry which eventuated in the appointment of the Commission presided over by Cardinal Mazzella, whose views on the subject of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church were well known, and further determined the efforts he made to represent the Church of England in such a light at Rome as would make it appear that all efforts in the direction of reunion were futile and useless. It must also be obvious to any one reading the letters that if men like Padre de Augustinis were able to conclude in favour of the validity of English ordinations, there were materials in the hands of the cardinals,¹ to whom the matter was finally referred, which made another decision than that declaring the Orders null and void at least possible. An acute French critic, in reply to a letter of mine at the time, said :—

Vous avez remarqué comme moi que de toutes les causes de nullité invoquées jusqu'à aujourd'hui, la Bulle ne retient qu'un vice de forme et un vice d'intention, le point historique est abandonné ; de plus la question est nettement regardée comme juridique. La chose la plus importante est que le Pape ait été conduit à donner les raisons de la condamnation. Il faut que votre poussée ait été bien forte pour qu'on

hands of the officials of the Holy Office. But this was objected to—by whom we do not know—as they would be sure to pass their judgment against the validity. A Commission of Cardinals was then contemplated, and some Cardinals were even asked to take part in it ; but it was calculated that the result would probably be the same. It was then proposed to have this secret Commission.²—*Leaves from My Diary*, by Abbot Gasquet, pp. 26-27.

And again, 'A letter from Cardinal Vaughan says that he has urged the Holy Father again not to "change the practice of the Church for three hundred years without the fullest investigation, and without the co-operation of the representatives of the Catholic Church in England."—*Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹ It is to be remembered that the business of the Commission of which the Abbé Duchesne, Padre de Augustinis, and Father Scannell were members was merely to give their opinions upon the matter in hand, and to prepare the way for its consideration by the Commission of Cardinals to which it was subsequently referred. This is explicitly stated by Abbot Gasquet in his *Leaves from My Diary*, p. 69 : 'Friday, June 5th. The Holy Father to-day said he desired that the case should proceed without unnecessary delay. He had heard that some people considered that it was the function of our Commission, now at an end, to judge the case, and he desired that it should be known that all we had to do was to prepare the way for the judicial examination which is to come now.'

se soit décidé à vous fermer ainsi la brèche par laquelle vous étiez en train de passer. Ce qui ressort, je crois, clairement de la Bulle c'est que l'examen de la Commission des Cardinaux s'est porté sur le point de savoir s'il y avait lieu de revenir sur les décisions antérieures : la lutte était entre la politique générale d'union et le Saint Office . . . L'union se fera en sauvegardant l'honneur des deux corps ou elle ne se fera pas, mais une chose était de reconnaître vos ordres, et une autre de les condamner ; la première n'était pas essentielle pour la continuation de votre campagne, la seconde vous arrête tout net.

Mr. Gladstone made a similar observation : 'The Pope's good intentions,' he wrote, 'have broken down, and the true spirit of the Curia has triumphed over them.' A letter from the Bishop of Peterborough makes the same remark : 'First the conception of a higher duty, then endless diplomacy ; in its course expediency creeps into the foremost place, the original point disappears, and the upshot is something as nearly as possible the reverse of what was originally intended . . . the Roman Church is primarily a State, and political considerations over-ride spiritual considerations habitually and universally.'

That the Orders were declared invalid was due to the fact that Rome had abandoned the hope of promoting reunion. For the abandonment of that hope Cardinal Vaughan was primarily responsible : to destroy it had been his object from the beginning, and he had used all the means in his power to secure that end. Everything that is recorded in his life proves it. The *Risposta* itself is conclusive as to the fact ; its whole object was to represent the Church of England in such a light as to compel the abandonment of what the Pope had originally sought and intended. I have already said that the Cardinal's success was largely due to Archbishop Benson's failure to rise to the occasion : justice requires that this should be stated. But in view of the fact that Cardinal Vaughan made no secret of having done his best to secure the issue of the Bull, I cannot wonder that writing to a French correspondent I should have said : 'Pour ceux qui savent que le Cardinal Vaughan

a fait tout ce qu'il a pu pour obtenir la condamnation de nos ordres, c'est un peu fort qu'il essaie de donner l'impression qu'on est arrivé à la condamnation avec regret. Cela rappelle les larmes du crocodile.'

I turn from the past to the future, and to the consideration of such elements for hope as may seem to emerge from the history of the failure recorded in the previous pages.

It has been a reproach that in England there is so little care for anything outside the National Church, that the members of the Church of England glory in their isolation. The perusal of these pages will show that this, at least, can be said no longer. None could blame the members of the Church of England if, in the circumstances narrated, in face of the repudiation of the Orders conferred by the Church of England, and the organised attempt to induce its members to abandon its communion,¹ they should acquiesce, so far as Rome is concerned, in their state of isolation. But though none could blame, is there not a more excellent way? It is impossible to believe that it is so God would have us act. We cannot doubt that He wills the reunion of Christendom, and what He wills we must try to realise. It still remains a duty to labour for peace, and it will be well to consider the result of recent events in the light of a faith which knows that in the end the good cause must prevail. At first sight it might seem that the hope of reunion has been made more distant than ever, that Rome has definitely precluded herself from taking a more generous view of the position and claims of the Church of England, and that recent action has not only embittered the relations between the English Episcopate and the Holy See, but made any reopening of negotiations for peace on either side impossible. It seemed so at the time, but it may be doubted whether in the end this will be found to be the case. The controversy as to the validity of English Orders has been disentangled

¹ By the formation of a Fund for the support of 'Converted Anglican Clergymen,' who in prompt obedience should take the step of entering the Catholic Church. See Cardinal Vaughan's Address to the Catholic Conference at Hanley, 28th September 1896.

from many of the difficulties which had been supposed to surround it. The historical fact of the Succession may be supposed to be settled,¹ and the difficulties which remain have been practically narrowed to the question of the rite by which Holy Orders are conferred in the Church of England in connection with the intention of those who framed it. To quote Mr. Wilfrid Ward's words in his *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*, it is not so much 'the certain invalidity of the form *per se*, but its invalidity when we consider the manner in which it was framed, and the intention of its framers.'² On a consideration of these two points together English ordinations have been declared invalid, not, be it observed, on the ground that the form was necessarily insufficient in itself,³ but because it was argued insufficient in view of the circumstances under which, and the persons by whom, it was put out. Under different circumstances, the same form, according to the Bull, might not have been deemed insufficient.⁴ This is the loophole which the Bull leaves open, and it is one through which, in the future, much may issue.

The conclusions of the Bull are formally based upon historical considerations. If the reading of history here followed should prove to be inaccurate, the conclusions fall by the very principle on which they are founded.

¹ The author of Cardinal Vaughan's *Life* seems to deny this by stating the half truth that 'Nothing at all was decided about the doubtful consecration of Barlow.'—*Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 224.

² *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*, vol. i. p. 300. He quotes Lingard's letter of 25th February 1840 to Wiseman.—'You ask what I think of arguing the validity of their Orders. I doubt its policy. It is a very irritating subject, and one on which I should not hope to persuade if it be confined to the validity of the form.'

³ This would seem to be at least implied by the Bull of Paul iv., and the subsequent Brief of the same year, 1555, cited in the condemnation of English Orders. Under that Bull and Brief those who had been ordained by a genuine bishop were to be received as priests, nothing being said as to the rite. Genuine bishops are defined as bishops consecrated in *forma ecclesiae*. But many of the bishops reconciled by Pole—Thirlby for instance—had certainly been consecrated in *forma ecclesiae*, and they were therefore to be accounted genuine bishops. These had for three years been ordaining priests and deacons according to the English rite. Those so ordained were, according to the terms of the Brief, to be received. By implication, therefore, the Pope at least tolerates the English rite, considered in itself.—*A Roman Diary*, pp 171-176.

⁴ Cf. p. 379.

To consider the matter more closely : Two positions may be taken, the historical fact of the succession apart, from either of which the denial of the validity of English Orders would logically follow. It may be asserted either (*a*) that the English Ordinal, having regard to what the Church has always required for a valid ordination, is found on comparison with other Ordinals to be insufficient in itself, or (*b*) that it is insufficient because it omits certain things which the Church, at all events in the West, has added from time to time in order to express the meaning and character it attaches to Holy Orders. In a word, that the Church, having power to appoint and alter the form and matter of the Sacraments, where these have not been directly prescribed by Christ, any abandonment of the form and matter appointed by the Church from time to time is in itself evidence of a defective intention, and therefore invalidates the Orders so conferred.

The first position is practically abandoned as untenable. Duchesne, Gasparri, Boudinhon, the Padre de Augustinis, every one who has considered the English Ordinal merely in the light of the ancient Ordinals, has pronounced more or less favourably in regard to it.

The second position, in view of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Decree *Ad Armenos* of Eugenius iv. declaring the porrection of the instruments with suitable words to be the form and matter of the Sacrament of Order, might have been sufficient to invalidate English Orders if—despite the theological and historical difficulties attending such a course—it had been insisted upon alone.

But, in fact, the Bull took neither position definitely, importing into its decision the consideration of the supposed heresies of the framers of the English Ordinal in order, by determining the evil intention with which the changes and suppressions were made, to find grounds for invalidating Orders conferred by a form which the Bull itself did not exclude as insufficient. The result is a document the theological cogency of which is by no means obvious.

Now, in regard to the intention with which the changes

were made, and with respect to the changes in themselves, let us, for argument's sake, admit that some of the reforming prelates and divines responsible for the Ordinal wished to eliminate what the Bull holds essential for a valid ordination. It is notorious, on the other hand, that some of those concerned in the changes wished exactly the opposite. Why are we to assume that the results arrived at were in entire accord with the wishes and intentions of the innovating prelates, and entirely uninfluenced by the wishes and intentions of those who desired to preserve all that was essential for a valid ordination? The intentions of the one party are surely of as much importance as the intentions of the other. If the changes made were the result not of any one set of intentions, but of two, the Ordinal will be the issue of a double action; and consequently, on the grounds taken by the Bull itself, the general intention which produced the Ordinal being doubtful, the most that can be said against the Orders conferred by it is that they are doubtful too.

Archbishop Manning and those who acted with him at the Vatican Council were declared by the Bishop of Orleans to be guilty of a grave theological error in declaring the Pope infallible apart from the Church. No one, however, asserts, although the definition at the Vatican Council was certainly due more to the influence of Archbishop Manning than to that of any one else, that the decree necessarily represents his opinions alone, and was uninfluenced by those of others. We know, in fact, that this was not the case; and it has come to be seen that the opposition at the Council did prevent the infallibility, as Archbishop Manning and Mr. Ward understood and intended it, from being asserted. Why are we precluded from supposing that something analogous happened with respect to the English Ordinal, and that owing to the overruling providence of God the results intended by one party were prevented from taking effect by the action of the other?

When it comes to be understood that much of the language used by Archbishop Cranmer and others on the subject of the Eucharist, and the suppressions and changes

introduced into the Ordinal and Liturgy—however much we may regret them—were due in the first instance to a real desire to vindicate the all-sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ on the Cross, and to combat exaggerations of doctrine—not to use a stronger word—then prevalent, and not altogether unknown at the present day, a great step will have been taken towards explaining that language in a more favourable sense, and therefore, on the basis of the Bull itself, in the direction of peace.

When certain theologians can say that in the Mass there is a distinct sacrifice (the essence of sacrifice having previously been declared to consist in the destruction of the victim), and that this sacrifice consists in a mystic immolation by which there is a real separation of the Body and the Blood, and a self-emptying of Christ who, as in the Incarnation He assumed the limited nature of man, so in the Eucharist lives a life yet further limited, when, moreover, it is thought possible to discuss which is the more efficacious of the two, the death of Christ on the Cross, or the death of Christ in the Eucharist,¹ we can understand the object of the Thirty-first Article, and the reasons which led to the changes in the Ordinal and Liturgy.

However such language may be explained, it must be admitted that it requires explanation just as much as the statement of those English divines who may seem to imply, in their dread of teaching derogatory to the all-sufficiency of the expiation made by the death of Christ upon the Cross, that the Eucharistic Sacrifice consists merely in the offering of praise and thanksgiving and the oblation of ourselves our souls and bodies, as a living sacrifice to God. On this subject Father Puller's articles in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, endorsed as they were by the Archbishop of York, are of permanent value. In the words

¹ *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. i. p. 701. Cf. Cardinal Franzelin's theory of the *examinatio*—the point of which is that our Lord, in the Eucharist, condescends to a reduction to the condition of food, and thus 'every connatural activity of corporeal life ceases, in so far as He is formally placed under the species,' and the sacred Body and Blood 'is given over to the will of His creatures just as if they were inanimate things.' 'This 'emptying' is the 'destruction' in which sacrifice consists.—Franzelin, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, pp. 404-405.

of Bossuet, 'It is not retractations, but explanations that are required.'¹

In this connection the letter *Saepius Officio* of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in which the claim of the Church of England to teach what the Catholic Church has always taught in regard to the Real Presence, the Sacrifice, and the Priesthood, can hardly fail in the future to have important results. We may also surely welcome the careful statements as to the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the Priesthood in the *Vindication* of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* put out by the Roman Catholic bishops in England, contrasting as they do with the kind of teaching above referred to. There is nothing in those statements—with possibly a word of explanation here and there—which need contradict the teaching of the Church of England. If the doctrine of Transubstantiation can be identified with a simple belief that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the Body and Blood of Christ, and if the Eucharistic Sacrifice be asserted to depend only on a valid Consecration, the differences between Rome and England on these points, in presence of a real desire for peace, will be easily adjusted. Such statements show, when there is a wish to state theological positions in a form likely to be acceptable, how much may be done to facilitate an agreement. Meanwhile, the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* is no infallible utterance, and whenever there is a wish to avoid its apparent conclusions, it will perhaps not be so difficult to do so as some people at the present moment assert. The decree of Eugenius iv. addressed to the Armenians, which many theologians of the time treated as a dogmatic definition when it is brought into contact with the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, supplies a warning as to the imprudence of asserting that any Papal utterance is, I will not say irreformable, but incapable of being explained.²

Other influences, too, seem likely to promote the interests

¹ For Bossuet's own explanation of the Sacrifice, see p. 436. See also letter from the Abbé Portal.

² See also the chapter on Gregory ix.'s denial of the validity of Greek ordinations in Mr. Lacey's *Roman Diary*, p. 331.

of peace. The historical and critical school of theologians which is rising into such prominence at home and abroad cannot fail to influence the current of religious thought in the future. Ignorance and prejudice are the fruitful parents of misconception and division, and in proportion as all sides are animated by a large-hearted desire to arrive at the truth for the truth's sake, and are as anxious to be fair to a theological opponent as to a friend, we are likely to see obstacles which now seem insurmountable reduced to very different proportions, and a way opened for the reunion in one fold of those who are kept apart by causes not always due to a simple desire to maintain the integrity of the Faith.

Meanwhile, all that has occurred has had very different results from those which might have been expected. Despite all that has happened, the question of reunion is not where it was fifteen years ago : it has been lifted into another sphere. The position of the Church of England is being understood abroad as it was never understood before ; the very nature of the discussion as to Orders implies a claim which is a revelation to foreign ecclesiastics. The Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* was expected to weaken the Church of England ; preparations were advertised for providing for the temporal necessities of the converts who were expected. Its results have been the very reverse. Instead of weakening the English Church, they have had the effect of strengthening and spreading its roots. Many have been compelled to think of their Orders as they never did before. It has shown that the Church of England can only be effectively defended on Catholic principles. There is reason to be thankful for this, and also for the fact that the very thing which checked for a time all hopes of reconciliation with Rome has led to more than one demonstration of goodwill on the part of the Orthodox Eastern Church.

Some recent works of Greek and Russian theologians on English ordinations are a proof of the good which grows out of evil. Just as the denial of the Orders of the English Church is helping us to vindicate our true position at home, so it has induced these theologians to undertake

a serious and impartial investigation of those Orders abroad. We must indeed earnestly pray for reunion not only with Rome, but with the East, and as we do so we must rejoice to think—in view of the declaration of Cardinal Vaughan and the Roman Catholic bishops in England that the teaching of Rome on the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice is identical with that of the East—that union between the Orthodox Church and ourselves will also be a step, and a great step, towards reunion with Rome herself.

Christina Rosetti has well said :—

Strength attaches to union, resource to multiplicity. The Kingdom of Death, (notwithstanding that death is dissolution), retains strength while it coheres, for our Lord Himself declared that were Satan divided against himself his kingdom could not stand. How much more would the kingdom of life—which is the Catholic Church—be invincibly strong if all Christendom were to become as at the first, of one heart and of one mind ? Alas, for the offences of former days, and of these days, for our fathers' offences and for our own, which have torn to shreds Christ's seamless vesture. 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge.'

Nevertheless, inasmuch as multiplicity is allied to resource, let us, until better may be, make capital even of our guilty disadvantage. Let us be provoked to good works by those with whom we cannot altogether agree, yet who in many ways set us a pattern. Why exclusively peer after defects while virtues stare us in the face ? Cannot we learn much from the devotion of Catholic Rome, the immutability of Catholic Greece, the zeal of many Protestants, and, when the Anglican Church has acquired and reduced to practice each virtue from every such source, holding fast meanwhile her own goodly heritage of gifts and graces, then may those others likewise learn much of her, until to every church, congregation, soul, God will be all in all. We thought we saw stones on the distant hills : they were really sheep, and God always knew them as such—the mistake was only ours. We thought to read 'Samaria,' but it was 'S^a Maria' the letters really spelt.

Some other considerations must be touched upon if reunion is to be treated from the point of view of members of the Church of England with anything like completeness.

What do we mean by the word 'Church'? Does not an ambiguity attach to its use which is often the cause of misconception? Dr. Newman long ago pointed out that if we would define our terms we should generally find either that we were agreed, or that, differing on first principles, controversy was useless. In speaking of the Church, I think Roman Catholics have often in mind its exterior organisation and government, rather than the Church as the mystical Body of Christ. Members of the Church of England, on the other hand, when they speak of the Church, have almost always in view the Church, not as it is determined by its outward organisation, but as it is composed of those who are sacramentally united to Christ. Both ideas are involved in the conception of the Church, but the dwelling upon the one rather than the other is, I am sure, a fruitful source of misunderstanding.

Let me state a little more fully how the matter would occur to the ordinary member of the Church of England. The object and scope, he would say, of the Christian religion is to establish a real and permanent union between each individual of the human race and Christ. This supernatural life of union with Himself Christ communicates to man through the Sacraments, the validity of which is guaranteed to us by the Divine organisation of the Apostolic ministry. Since the object of the Christian religion and of the Sacraments administered by the Church is to establish and perpetuate a permanent union between us and Christ, 'that we may dwell in Him and He in us,' all that has been enjoined by our Lord and His Church for the communication of His divine life is essential to our position in a way nothing else is or can be. There may be things useful, things salutary, nay, even things of divine appointment relating to the organisation of the Church, but if they do not directly subserve that ministration of the spirit by which, through the sacramental system of the Church, we are made partakers of Christ, they are on a different level. They are not *in pari materia*, and as such our attitude in respect to them is necessarily different to that which we are bound to maintain in regard to those means of grace which have

been instituted for the purpose of uniting us in the bond of a common life with our Divine Head. These we must guard always, and at all costs; those, under certain circumstances, will not carry the same obligation with them.¹

Apply this principle to the claims of the Protestant bodies and those of the Roman Church respectively. For practical purposes, what is usually understood by Protestantism is a denial of the sacramental system, that is, of any divinely appointed external and visible agency by which the gifts of grace are ministered to us. The new birth is not necessarily connected with baptism, confirmation is not the means by which an additional gift of the Holy Ghost is imparted to us, the Eucharist is not the communication to us, under the

¹ This is drawn out in a speech made by a distinguished Jesuit at the Congress of Catholic Theologians interested in the relations of the Eastern and Western Churches which met at Velehrad in Moravia, July 1907. The Archbishop of Olmütz was patron of the Congress, over which the Archbishop of Lemberg, Metropolitan of Galicia, presided. The Jesuit, Father John Urban, discussed the technical question whether absolutions given by priests of the Eastern Orthodox Church could be recognised as valid, and concluded for the affirmative. Orthodox priests, he contended, exercising their priesthood in good faith, incur no ecclesiastical censure, and are not deprived of jurisdiction. This conclusion was fortified by reference to the practice of the Roman Church with regard to members of the Orthodox Church submitting themselves to the Papal authority. The question discussed was, in a sense, purely technical, and was treated on technical grounds; but its larger interest was due to the anterior question concerning the constitution of the Church that was involved.

The Jesuit theologian showed that some modification of the conception of the Church, commonly entertained by his brethren, was necessary. Since the time of the Council of Trent it has been generally taught in the schools that the unity of the Church is purely hierarchical, and that the unity of the hierarchy consists exclusively in actual communion with the Pope. It follows from this teaching that schismatics of whatever degree—all, in short, who are not actually in communion with Rome—are not in any sense members of the body of the true Church of Christ. To meet the difficulties arising from the obvious work of grace in individuals so separated, a specious theory has been evolved, according to which they belong invisibly to the 'soul' of the Church. It is this theory which Father Urban considers to be overthrown by the actual practice of Rome in regard to members and priests of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The validity of absolutions given by such priests implies that they are living members of the body of the Church, though separated from Rome by the schism of East and West. The consequences are, theologically, of immense importance; for it follows that even those who consider it the bounden duty of every Christian to be in communion with the Holy See, must at the same time acknowledge that Christians who fail in this duty may nevertheless have a solid standing-ground in the Church of Christ. The further conclusion is inevitable, that Catholicity is not determined merely by communion with Rome. If this theological opinion should prevail, the greatest bar to the reconciliation of the Churches will be thrown down.

forms of bread and wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ, absolution is not the channel by which the pardon of sins is conveyed to us, but merely an assurance of God's willingness to forgive sinners, the Church is not a visible organisation instinct with a divine life, but an invisible society, or a mere human association.

Now, certainly, we have no right, as we can have no desire, to judge individuals. God's mercy is over all His works. If everywhere he that worketh righteousness according to his lights is accepted before Him, much more will He accept those whose rejection of His Sacraments arises in great part from ignorance, in great part from the sins of others. What God condemns is a wilful rejection of His voice, and, in this case, the scandals that have existed in past times in the Church itself, and the imperfect lives of Christians, must make us hesitate before we charge all those who reject the sacramental system of the Church with a wilful rejection of the truth.

But while we admit to the full, with all the consequent excuses which flow from such admission, that the great religious convulsion of the sixteenth century, to take one instance out of many, was the result of abuses which saints had long deplored, but which the highest ecclesiastical authorities had been too indifferent and too worldly to mend, it yet remains true that the result of that convulsion has been, not to reform the practice, but to mutilate the religion of Christendom.

If man, created in the image of God, with capacity for knowing God and loving Him, cannot be satisfied apart from God : if, in every time and place since he was driven out of Paradise, the heart of man has been seeking after God, if haply he may find Him ; if God, who created man for Himself, has on His side been ever calling man back to Himself, reaching down to him from the Mount of Sinai to the Mercy Seat between the Cherubim, from the Manger to the Cross, from the Cross to the Altar, and from the Altar to the sanctuary of man's heart, there to abide as friend abides with friend : if these are the relations between God and man, as they are revealed to us in Jesus Christ, then

any system of religion which stops short at the Incarnation, while it rejects the sacramental system by which the Incarnation is extended to us, is not the whole counsel of God.

Has God—for it is this which lies at the heart of the question—in answer to the longings of humanity, visited indeed His people, but only for thirty-three years, and in one corner of the earth; or is the sacramental system—and, as the sun in that galaxy of glory, the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar—still the point of contact between Him and us, the means by which He lives in us, and we in Him? Do we in the Holy Eucharist really possess not any mere gift of grace, but the Author of grace Himself? Is it true that the union which was effected between God and man by the Incarnation is within our own reach, so that the humblest and most insignificant Christian who approaches the altar has nothing to envy those who companied with Jesus Christ when He was upon earth—nay, rather, is admitted to a closeness of union with Him that was not vouchsafed even to the Apostles in its fulness till after the Day of Pentecost? Are we brought by the Lord's Supper into a living and personal relation with the Passion and death of Christ? Is that Passion, is that death the centre and constraining force of our spiritual life? Is the Lord's Supper the means by which the whole body of the faithful have their share in the offering of their Head? Or, is the Lord's Supper merely an affecting ceremony by which we endeavour to remind ourselves of our absent Lord? Has the Christian Church neither priest, nor sacrifice, nor altar, or does Christ indeed abide a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck, by virtue of whose Priesthood we also take our share in the offering of the one true, pure, immortal Sacrifice which is worthy of the acceptance of our Father in heaven? Is the gift of the Holy Ghost vouchsafed to us in order that He, by whose instrumentality God the Son assumed our humanity, may, through the Sacraments of the Church by which the grace of that restored Humanity is imparted to us, unite each several one of us to God? Or, is the Holy Ghost bestowed upon us apart from any purpose of bringing

us into union with the Incarnate Son, whose Incarnation thus becomes merely a fact of past history calculated indeed to excite our gratitude, but a fact with which, except so far as His merits may be imputed to us, we have no direct and present relation ?

To these questions historical Christianity has given one answer, and the later forms of Christian opinion, which have had their origin during the last four hundred years, have given another : the one has affirmed the supernatural character and effects of the Sacramental System, the others have ended by practically denying them. The faith of the individual, instead of being the means by which he receives the Sacraments to his benefit, has come to be looked upon as something which in fact creates the gift, which it is its real office to appropriate, and as such has usurped the place of the Sacraments in the economy of Grace.

Now, if this is the teaching of Protestant religious systems, the questions at issue between them and us are questions not merely of a more or less perfect form of Church government, but of matters affecting the chain by which the relations between God and man—interrupted by the Fall—are renewed and sustained. Our attitude towards them is, therefore, necessarily determined. We cannot, for the sake of peace, surrender what we believe to be an integral part of the Christian religion. We can only ask to be allowed the happiness of supplying what is wanting in their organisation, in order that they with us may rejoice in the possession of those means of grace which have been instituted by Christ for the life of the Church.

Similar considerations seem to determine our attitude towards the Roman Church, and our duties in regard to the claims of the Holy See. Those claims, so far as we are concerned, generally resolve themselves into the assertion that visible communion with the Roman See is, under all circumstances, an absolute necessity. But this claim involves the assertion that visible communion with Rome is on a level with the possession of an orthodox Creed, with an unbroken succession of bishops from the Apostles, and with valid Sacraments, as part, under all circumstances,

of the organisation necessary for the life of the Church. Now, however much we may deplore the interruption of visible communion between ourselves and Rome, however much we may condemn the conduct of those (on both sides) who were responsible in the sixteenth century for the separation, however much we may recognise the Primacy of the successor of St. Peter, and acknowledge the Holy See to be the centre of ecclesiastical unity, I say, however much we may be prepared to admit all this, the fact remains that visible communion with Rome has no obvious place in that chain of agencies by which the divine life is communicated to man, and man is reunited to God. Its relation to that chain is at best an indirect one. To be outside the Roman obedience does not, for example, *per se*, invalidate the consecration of the Eucharist. The Roman Church makes no such claim in regard to Russia and the East. Visible communion with Rome occupies a different position in the economy of Grace to that which we assign to the Apostolic Succession and valid Sacraments. The level upon which it stands is different; and, with a different level, necessarily comes a corresponding change of attitude and duty on our part. In the one case there is a clear obligation laid upon us; it does not appear that in the other case we are, under all circumstances, bound in the same way.

A consideration of what the Catholic Faith is leads to the same result. To reunite God and man is the scope of the Christian religion. 'This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.' That reunion ultimately depends upon the personal relations existing within the Godhead, because it is those relations which supply a basis for the Incarnation of the Son and the consequent reconciliation of man to God. The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity and of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ are truths upon which the salvation of man depends, and the Athanasian Creed only expresses a necessary truth when it declares that 'whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.' The facts proclaimed by the Catholic

Creeds and our adherence to them, so far as we have opportunity, are necessary, then, in the first place, for the reunion of man with God. This necessity extends, in the second place, to the possession of valid Sacraments, for it is by the Sacraments that the benefits of the Incarnation are extended to us.

No one who notes that the Athanasian Creed is ordered by the Church of England to be recited on thirteen of the principal feasts of the year, and who studies the Book of Common Prayer, beginning with the Administration of Holy Baptism, continuing with the Catechism, the Order of Confirmation, the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, the form for the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony, the Ordinal, and the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, can doubt that the Church of England (1) insists on the necessity of a right faith, and (2) contemplates the bringing of the whole life of man from its beginning to its end within the sphere of the sacramental agencies of the Church. Introduce as a necessary link in the chain which reunites man to God the claims of the Holy See, and you are at once involved not only in the difficulty of reconciling such an assertion with the history of the Church, and with the Catholic Creeds—a difficulty which exists in regard to no other link in the chain—but you have practically added to the Creed of Christendom an article of Faith which lacks that intrinsic dependence upon, and organic connection with, the other truths of Revelation which characterise the other Articles of the Catholic Faith.

A consideration of what Faith is in itself, therefore, leads us to disallow the Roman claims in their extreme form, and this precisely on the same principle which compels us to reject all Protestant systems of religion: the latter appear to deny what is an integral part of the Gospel; the former seems to make the fruits of the Gospel depend upon considerations that belong to a lower plane.

Remark that what is here said is not brought forward as against the Primacy of the Roman Church, or even as against her claim to be the divinely appointed centre of unity, but it is brought forward as against the negative consequences

deduced from those claims. Churches and individuals are safe in affirming what they know to be true : it is otherwise when they begin to deny. That the Church of England ought to be in communion with Rome, we admit : that interruption of that communion destroys all Catholic life, we deny. To arrive at such a conclusion it is not enough to prove that every part of the Church ought by right to be in visible communion with Rome ; it is obvious that every part of the Church ought to be in visible communion with every other part ; what is required is to prove the absolute necessity, under all circumstances, of such visible communion as a condition of membership in the Church which is Christ's Body. Many things may affect the *bene esse* of the Church which yet do not belong to its *esse*.

There ought to be no schisms or divisions in the Church ! Granted. The whole Church, the East, and the Churches in visible communion with Canterbury alike, ought to be at one with each other and in visible communion with the Roman See ! Granted also. With St. Irenaeus we may well exalt the dignity of that Church which alone in the West claims as its founders not one, but two Apostles, and those Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. Certainly if division amongst any of the Successors of the Apostles is grievous, much more grievous is a division which affects the relations of any portion of the Church with the Successor of the Prince of the Apostles. If the See of Canterbury justly commands the respect and affection of the bishops of the whole English world, so that a Metropolitan of India or a Primate of New Zealand out of communion with Canterbury would be in an abnormal position, much more abnormal must be the position of a Church separated from a See possessing the history and the traditions which attach to the Tomb of St. Peter, our own parent and instructor in the Faith, through St. Gregory and St. Augustine, through Vitalian and Theodore.

We have, indeed, need to consider how far we are responsible for the continuance of such a separation, and to be earnest and untiring in our efforts to bring it to a close. But all this does not prove that visible communion with

the Roman See has a place among the necessary links of that chain by which man is reunited to God, or that a schism, for which we ourselves are only partly responsible, dries up at its fountainhead the whole stream of Sacramental Grace. The question how far a schism in the Body of Christ cuts men off from communion with the Divine Head of the Church must surely depend upon the circumstances of each particular case, and the degree of guilt attaching to the respective sides in the quarrel. We are not called upon to deny that the present state of things is schismatical, but only, with Archbishop Bramhall, on a review of the whole case, to deny that it is 'criminal schism.' There may be cases in which so much is to be said on both sides that it becomes impossible with any sense of security to apportion the amount of blame, and therefore of guilt, which attaches to one side or the other. It is not enough to condemn schism in itself: the causes which produced it have to be considered. It is just here, however high we may place the Roman claims, that it is impossible to hold Rome guiltless. To do justice to the Reformation and those who were concerned in it, one must appreciate the history of the time, and the influences of the Renaissance on Christian belief and morals.

'If ever,' says Dr. Mozley, sometime Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and certainly the most judicial of writers, 'there was an age in which the external working system of the Church was calculated to provoke and excite . . . it was the age of the Reformation. It exhibited that peculiar mixture so poignantly irritating . . . of the grossest abuses with the most placid and easy self-complacency in those who maintained and were responsible for them. The Court of Rome allowed the lowest fraud and imposture in the working system of the Church, and suffered faith and reason to be shocked, itself all the while reposing in a superciliously intellectual and even rationalistic philosophy. . . . There was impatience and self-will doubtless in the spirit and in the way in which the . . . Reformers raised and carried on their opposition, but Rome herself had certainly no right to complain of it. If they were guilty, she was not innocent; nor has she any right on the field of controversy to assume that position which she does, of having been sinned against without having sinned. The human mind at that time

was entering on a new and mysterious stage of its history, and that great intellectual movement which has been steadily advancing ever since, and trying the world's faith in its progress, had begun.

'Rome herself partook largely of that revival. Did she bear the test well and set the example so much wanted at the commencement of such a movement of intellect not really opposing faith? Or, dazzled herself, and carried away by the revival, did she set the whole world the very contrary example of intellect undermining faith? Did she, when she headed that intellectual movement, teach the world how to bear it? We have the answer to the question in the accounts transmitted to us of a Papal Court which seemed by some inebriation of the intellect to have dreamed itself out of Christianity into Paganism, ignored, by a sort of common consent, the Gospel revelation, and instituted again the Groves of Academus. An elegant heathen Pope who carried on Tusculan disputations, Cardinals who adorned their walls with scenes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and devoted themselves to Ciceronian Latin, and a whole scene of luxurious intellectuality in Rome contrasted bitterly with the palpable superstitions and abuses of the out-of-door world. And the centre of Christendom, putting itself quietly and unconcernedly *ab extra* to a whole system for which it was responsible, while it taught men to despise that system, provoked at the same time disgust and rebellion against its own hypocrisy.

'Nor did the intellectual movement of the age show better fruits in the morals than in the faith of the Roman Church. The morals of the Roman Ecclesiastics were scandalous, and it was only a question whether these vices themselves or the shamelessness with which they indulged them was the worse feature.'

Is it conceivable in the face of such an indictment, and it is one which can hardly be denied, that the guilt of schism, and therefore its consequences, should rest only on one side? In proportion as the authority of the Roman See is insisted upon, in the same degree is responsibility for the exercise of that authority increased.

Was the authority of the Roman See during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries mainly directed to the advancement of temporal or of spiritual ends? What were its objects, and what the weapons by which it attempted to secure them? The authority of the Church is divine, the exercise

of that authority is human, and occasions may arise when the exercise of that authority will be such as to justify resistance, and, therefore, to modify the consequences attaching to schism in the abstract. No authority can be more complete or claim a diviner origin than that of a parent: does any one assert that there are no cases in which that authority may not be resisted? A bishop, if any authority is divine, rules his Diocese *jure divino*: does any one pretend that on that account resistance to every exercise of Episcopal authority involves the guilt of schism?

Is the exercise of the authority of the Holy See an exception to this rule? Bellarmine, the most papal of controversialists, allows that 'as it is lawful to resist the Pope if he should invade our bodies, so it is lawful to resist him invading our souls, or troubling the Commonwealth, and much more if he should endeavour to destroy the Church.'¹ But if the Pope meet such lawful resistance by excommunication, upon whom does the guilt of the resulting schism lie? Ecclesiastical history seems to show that the occupants of the Apostolic See never hesitated to interfere whenever they thought the general interests of the Church required it, and it would appear that in the West, at least, such right, down to the sixteenth century, was never seriously disputed; but history also shows that there was never any hesitation in opposing such interference if there was good reason for doing so. It might be difficult to define the precise limits which marked the rights of the Holy See on one side, and those of the Episcopate and local churches on the other, but the witness of antiquity is decisive that the centralisation which now prevails in the Roman Church was for many centuries unknown.

But it will perhaps be said that all such considerations are beside the mark, that whatever exaggerations there may have been of Roman claims, however little their present development was foreseen in early times, and however different the relations between the Episcopate and Rome may be now from what they were even in the sixteenth century, it still remains true that Rome is the Mother and Mistress of

¹ *De Rom. Pont.*, vol. ii. c. 29.

all Churches, that the Church must be visibly as well as invisibly one, that Christ has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, and it will be asked what explanation can be offered in support of a position which has to admit existing disunion and apparent failure.

Now, if by 'Mother and Mistress' is meant that the Church of England is the daughter of Rome, and that the Church of Rome was the instructress of England in the Faith, no one acquainted with history will deny the fact. If it is meant that on that account the Episcopate of the Anglican Church is formally subject to the Apostolic See, the same appeal to history disproves the statement.

To the assertion that no interruption of the Church's visible unity is possible without a confession that Christ's promises to the Church have been falsified, the answer is twofold, and it may be made in the words of the late Bishop of Brechin :—

The first attribute of the Church which the Creed declares is, that it is one. As Christ is one, and as His work is one, so there is one truth, for He is the incarnate Truth. And if there be one truth, there must needs be one vehicle of it. That unity is the object and the result of the Saviour's Prayer, and it finds its model in the mysterious relation which exists between the Father and the Son. It is of so high and exalted a nature, that it is only by the communication of a higher life that it can exist. And as it is divine in its source, so is it divine in its effect ; for by this unity men the more believe the mission of Christ : ' that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.' . . .

Now unity may be divided into objective and subjective. Objective unity is that inwrought by our Head, Jesus Himself, through union with Himself. It is wrought on His Side, by the communication of the 'one Spirit' and by the Sacraments, making us all one body in Him. It requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which He gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church. Subjective unity is unity of will, and intercommunion with one another. Subjective unity may be suspended, while objective unity is maintained. Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained, for the blessed Meletius is a saint. Subjective unity was sus-

pended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert. Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics. And this must also apply to the mighty dissension between the East and the West, and between ourselves and the rest of Christendom. It is deeply to be deplored that the state of the Church is as it is ; but let us hope that the evil is not so great as it seems, and that there is a fund of unity, if men only understood each other ; that the fissures are only surface ones ; that the disorder is functional, not organic. . . .

Since then our Lord's promise was fulfilled, in that dreary and hateful tenth century, when it was said that although our Lord was in the boat, men were afraid to wake Him up, but rather wished that He might never awake to judge them ; so may it be fulfilled now, although the fulness of His Presence may be abated through our divisions and want of love. We bear separate witness still to the One Faith which He gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds ; we all look to Him, as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His Own Body and Blood ; we all hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them. We are One Body, through the One Spirit, and all partaking of the One Body of Christ, all holding to the One Head. The Body is mangled, but, we believe, not severed, through loss of intercommunion. We are one, we trust, in One, although in some, even grave, things, not at one with one another.¹

Considerations such as these should make those hesitate who may be tempted to cast a slur upon their baptisms, their communions, and the absolutions they have received, by renouncing the Communion of the Church of England. They should also be weighed by those who would arrive at sound judgments upon the controversies inseparable from the question of reunion, and who desire to do any effectual work on behalf of that great cause. There are others which, in the interests of the same cause, it would surely be well that members of the Roman Communion should remember.

¹ *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, by Alexander Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, pp. 274-277, 288-289.

‘It will certainly be admitted,’ writes Canon Liddon in one of his published sermons, ‘that round the original deposit of the Faith there had grown up in process of time previous to the sixteenth century, partly from a desire to popularise Christianity, partly from other causes, an accretion of matter, some of it possibly true, much that was beautiful and poetic, some certainly false.’

When the storm of the Reformation burst these accretions were found unstable.

‘Here in England,’ continues Dr. Liddon, ‘though the work may have been done by rude and tyrannical hands, though defensible positions may—to some extent at least—have been in appearance abandoned in the desire to abandon positions which were not defensible, the Reformation nevertheless did one service, it cut away that coating of legendary and unprimitive matter which had overlaid the faith of the Apostles. To many a pious soul, no doubt, the operation was painful, for religious feeling, like the ivy, will often fasten upon the crumbling cement as eagerly and trustfully as upon the rock which defies the storm, but, looking to the intrinsic nature and to the permanent interests of Christianity, looking on to the ages of criticism then looming in the distance and which are now upon us, it must be felt that this corrective and expurgatory action of the Reformation has been in England and elsewhere a substantial service to the Christian faith.’

For instance, is it open to doubt that the strength of the Church’s defensive position in regard to the substance of the Faith has been increased by dissociating Christianity from the entail of legend that had gathered round it? Can it be safe in the interests of truth to allow what is certainly true and what is probable but not certainly true to occupy the same level? ‘Must not the crisp and jealous sense of truth,’ to use once more Canon Liddon’s words, ‘be impaired when the soul accepts with equal facility that which is certain, and such portions of the imaginary as it may conceive to be probable, and when the truths for which Apostles gave their lives are practically correlated with stories which in an age like ours brings the whole Faith into discredit and, for too many souls, into danger?’

In the area of politics Mr. Wilfrid Ward, in the very instructive chapter of his *Life of Cardinal Wiseman* headed 'The English "Papists,"' shows how largely the course of events under Elizabeth was due to the action of the Papacy, and to the real political danger to which England and the queen were exposed.

The life and death of a man like the Jesuit Campion, and there were many such, must appeal to all hearts. The example such men showed of faith and constancy deserved, who can doubt it, the martyr's crown. What can be more touching than the account of their sufferings, and of the Religious Houses from which they came decked as for a feast when the news was brought of another priest dying for the Faith across the sea. But not the English Government alone was responsible for their execution: the policy of the Roman Court, the claim of the Pope to depose the queen, the plots for her assassination, and the intrigues of such men as the Jesuit Parsons must at least share the responsibility. It is not only moderns, wise after the event, who have seen this: Niccolo Ormaneto,¹ Nuncio at Madrid under Philip II., wrote that the issue of the Bull 'had caused much evil, and the deaths of many Catholics.'

It is no member of the Anglican Communion, but the Rev. Ethelred Taunton, the author of the interesting volumes on the *English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, who says that the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, when it not only pronounced Elizabeth excommunicate, but went on to declare her deprived of her pretended rights to the Crown, to absolve all her subjects from their allegiance, and to proclaim excommunicate all who henceforth presumed to acknowledge her as queen, asserted a temporal right which could only result in deadly resistance. Charles Butler, in his *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics*, not only stated this as historical fact, but emphatically justified resistance to such a claim. It was the refusal to abandon this claim which put an end to the negotiations between James I. and the Roman Court, as it was the general line of conduct adopted by the occupants of the Holy See which led

¹ P. F. M. Caxini, *Niccolo Ormaneto*, p. 81, note.

Urban VIII. to say that his predecessors were responsible for the loss of England. How significant in this connection is the language of Cardinal Manning towards the close of his life when, in reference to Italy, he writes : 'The people in Italy are being lost, as the English people have been lost, by the same policy and the same blindness.' ¹

Have the authorities of the Roman Church nothing to learn from the warnings of history ?

Are the relations of Rome to the countries which nominally recognise her authority so harmonious, is the state of religion in them so satisfactory as to entitle her to suppose that she is entirely blameless, and has no confession of error to make ?

Can it be denied that the spiritual authority of the Holy See, entrusted to it for the edification of the Church, has sometimes exposed itself to the charge of being more anxious about the means by which it believed that authority was to be maintained, than about the ends for which it was instituted ?

Has the line always been preserved between what is of Faith, and what is a matter of opinion ? Has there been as much liberty within the Roman Communion since the sixteenth century as was the case before ? Has it tended to the healthy life of the Church, and been a help to the defence of the Faith, that liberty should have been so curtailed ?

Again, has not centralisation been carried to excess ? Has such centralisation been always to the advantage of local Episcopates, or has it not sometimes tended to weaken their initiative and involved them and the churches they are called upon to rule in difficulties which might otherwise have been avoided ?

The mission of Dom Leander to England, undertaken with the goodwill of Archbishop Laud in the interests of reconciliation, was thwarted by Jesuits and Puritans alike. Has nothing similar been seen in our own day ? Can it be thought that the history and character of the Roman Court have always been such as to justify the absolute

¹ *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. ii. p. 616.

rigidity in regard to all those who are separated from it which is declared to be its essential characteristic ?

I doubt if Roman Catholics in England the least realise how much might be done to further the cause of reunion by a generous and sympathetic attitude on their part in regard to the history and difficulties of the Church of England.

It would be entirely to misunderstand the object of these remarks to suppose them due to any hostility to Rome. The Roman Church appeals to all we value most. We should desire nothing so much as the renewal of the ancient relations which once bound England to Rome. Labour on that behalf is indeed a labour of love. It is only sought to indicate a line of thought which may serve to show why the representatives and descendants of those who in the sixteenth century adhered to the English Church in the quarrel with Rome need not abandon that position, but should, on the contrary, labour for the truth as loyal members of the Anglican Communion till the schism is healed, and Canterbury and Rome are again visibly one.

And here, may I venture to say something directed more specially to ourselves ? In fighting the battle of reunion, let us not shrink from advocating unpopular truths, let us have the courage of our opinions, let us not be afraid of admitting, freely and ungrudgingly, where mistakes have been made, and in what respects we have to retrace our steps so as to repair, as far as depends on us, the errors of the sixteenth century. Is it possible to deny, for example, that the rights of National Churches have been greatly exaggerated amongst us ? Can we defend ourselves from the charge of excessive insularity in our attitude towards the rest of Christendom ? In insisting on the rights of the English Episcopate, have we done anything like justice to the rights of the Apostolic See ? In view of the general drift of Church history, of the belief and practice of the Western Church, of the position recognised from the beginning as belonging to certain Patriarchal Sees, in view even of the teaching of the East, and of what

we see from our own experience—the necessity in the Anglican Communion of some centre round which the Episcopate can group itself—is there not much more reason than we are generally ready to suppose, for thinking that God did contemplate a visible centre of unity for His Church on earth, and that, in view of the future organisation of His spiritual Kingdom, the position occupied by Rome in the history of the world was the result of the overruling of Divine Providence ?

Members of the Church of England have need to face such questions, they have need—in the light of the considerations which they suggest—to ask themselves why the principle of authority in spiritual matters has come to be so largely ignored in England, and why the obligations imposed by the Article in the Creed, ‘I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church’ are so imperfectly recognised. Is it that the Church of England’s disregard of her own obligations to the Holy See and the rest of Christendom is visited upon her in the conduct of her own children ? If M. de Maistre was right in discerning the great opportunities possessed by the Church of England for promoting the reunion of Christendom, is he to be entirely disregarded when he speaks of her as preaching an obedience which she does not practice ?

It is only in the light of such considerations that we are able, as it seems to me, to deal freely with the question of reunion. They enable us to resist the temptation to twist facts and to take one-sided views of history. We shall not be afraid of recognising any claims which the Roman See may rightfully make on our allegiance, or of admitting the weak points, and those which need correction, in our own position.

In regard to the rights of the Apostolic See, let me say frankly that I think the members of the English Church have much to learn and much to admit. The great majority of the bishops of the West take one view of the rights claimed by Rome, the bishops in communion with Canterbury take another : there must be a point of view which can reconcile both. Is not such a point to be found in the

recognition of the Primacy and of the rights of the Apostolic See as the divinely designated centre of unity for the Church on the one side, and in the no less divinely instituted authority of the Episcopate on the other? To determine exactly the limits of these respective rights may be difficult, but it is in the assertion of both rights, and in the recognition of what is inherent in each, that the basis of future reunion may perhaps be found. To arrive at such a result one thing beyond all others is indispensable: a desire for peace and the wish on both sides to achieve an understanding.

Let us pray that a change may come over the spirit both of England and of Rome in this particular. Ignorance, misunderstanding, and prejudice are the real obstacles to reunion, and they exist on one side as much as on the other. How much indeed we have all to learn! How far we all fall short of the standard of that charity which hopeth all things, believeth all things, seeketh not her own, vaunteth not herself! What a need there is of patience on all sides!

To think of ourselves for a moment. Contrast the lives of our clergy as a body with the lives of the majority of the clergy of France; the extent of devotion and self-sacrifice which prevails among the latter, with the amount of secularity and easy living amongst ourselves. Are members of the English Church alive as they ought to be to the scandal of the infrequent Eucharists in so many churches, our neglect of confession, our absence of discipline, our disregard of authority? Can it be said, speaking generally, that they realise as they ought the consequences of the Incarnation as they affect our relations to her to whom the Angel Gabriel was sent as one 'full of grace,' and whom all generations were to call 'blessed'? Do they understand that as a Mother she must needs plead for all who are made the children of her dear Son, that, as Eve had a share in our fall, so Mary has her part in our redemption? What shall we say of our forgetfulness of all that is involved in the Communion of Saints, our neglect of the dead in Christ, the little heed we show to the obligations of Fast and Festival, our laxity about divorce, the way great

departments of Christian doctrine are ignored amongst us, the divisions which exist in our midst upon matters of the gravest importance ? Surely in regard to such and similar matters it is wiser, more humble, more truthful and more Christ-like, to confess our practical deflection from our principles than to ignore them, and to be able to see nothing except the faults and shortcomings of others. We complain of the injustice that is done to the Church of England by many of the members of the Roman Obedience, nor can any one say that such complaints are not amply justified. Nothing, indeed, can excuse the alliance which we have seen of late, as it has been seen before, of Roman controversialists with writers on the Protestant side, in order to embarrass the progress of Catholic truth, and the growth of Catholic principles amongst the members of the Church of England. But, have we not ourselves given the members of the Roman Church cause for a distrust of assertions of principle and belief to which, in the past, we have, many of us, paid so little regard ? What can they think of the utterances of ecclesiastics, whom it would be invidious to mention, but whose names must occur to every one in this connection ? I know that those utterances are often susceptible of explanation, but if there are members of the Church of England who fail to understand and are distressed by language used by members of the Roman Communion, may not members of the Roman Communion be equally shocked with what they see and hear in England, and be tempted to think that union with a Church which has so little discipline, which is divided into so many parties, and the members of which can profess with impunity such sentiments, is a hopeless and an idle dream ?

Further, let us remember how the Roman Catholic body in England has been treated under the Penal Laws till comparatively recent times. Only so late as the year 1786 a Benedictine, Dom Anselm Botton, was tried at York for his life on a charge of High Treason for converting a girl to the Roman Catholic Faith. What would members of the Church of England have said if their Prayer Books

had had to be disguised as the works of Horace or Virgil, or if they had been compelled, like a Lord Arundel of Wardour, to sell their carriage horses for five pounds apiece to their nearest neighbour, or, like Mr. Constable Maxwell of Everingham, to pay double land tax, for the sake of their religious convictions? What should we have said if these things had been done to us, and what would have been our feelings towards those in any way responsible for them? Yet, did the Anglican clergy as a body protest against them? Did those clergy as a body advocate, or oppose, Roman Catholic Emancipation?

We have to bear in the present the results of such conduct in the past. The sins of the fathers are visited on the children, and we have no right to expect that we shall at once be taken at our word, and an entirely different view of our position be accepted from what we have, many of us, been accustomed to take. Rather let us accept the consequences of our past in the spirit of sacrifice, and thank God for any opportunity which may be afforded us of expiating, by the patient bearing of present injustice and misrepresentation, what has been amiss in the past, and so of deserving a juster and more generous treatment in the future. Assuredly the existence of scandals in the Church of England and the fact that its rulers and people should have failed to act up to the principles they were pledged to maintain, does not constitute an argument in favour of Roman claims. The collapse of Anglicanism would not justify any in submitting to the Roman claims who were justified in resisting them before; but neglect of our duty, and faithlessness to our own principles, has cost the Church of England many whom she could ill afford to lose.

Thank God, all this is being changed; but when all is done we may be sure, having regard to the nature of the controversy between Rome and England, that there will always be some who, either from being imperfectly informed, or from various personal reasons—often unsuspected by themselves—will be likely to pass from one Communion to the other. What has to be said to such persons—whether on the Roman or Anglican side—is surely this:

First: that the cumulative argument being the normal form of the proof of Christianity, it is also the normal form of proof by which any portion of Christendom must seek to make good its claim: by such an argument numerous and varied considerations are dovetailed into one another, with the result that a partial attack on one point being borne by the rest, it often involves greater difficulty to suppose the whole system a failure in consequence of a particular objection, than any which arises from the confession of inability to answer a particular point in reference to such claim. Secondly: that the deepest proof of Christian doctrine is to be found in experiences outside the range of mere intellectual considerations. It is not to be expected that any argument on behalf of the claims of the Church or its teaching can be of such a nature as to compel the assent, in the way that attaches to mathematical demonstration.

It is not difficult to make out a case against the Church of England any more than against the Roman Church, or indeed, against Christianity itself. We have often been unjust to Rome in the past, and hitherto the advocates of the Roman Church have never tried to make the best of the English position. On the contrary, with rare exceptions, they have made the worst of it. Let us hope that the future will not in this respect reproduce the past. Meanwhile, the whole condition of the world and society is changing, and in the change many old prejudices are passing away. The temporal power may have been necessary for the Papacy in times past, but no one, I think, can deny that it has led to much which devout Catholics deeply deplore and condemn. The definite abandonment of all claim to such power may inaugurate a state of things which will remove many obstacles in the way of the reunion of Christendom. Even the progress of infidelity itself may be of service, and in the magnitude of the danger which threatens the Christian world positions may come to be abandoned on one side and accepted on the other, which shall prepare the way for the *Papa Angelicus* under whose guidance the scattered members of Christ's flock shall be again united in one visible fold.

We in England have not hitherto acted sufficiently up to our principles to make any such change on the part of Rome likely. Let members of the Church of England be true to what they are pledged, and fulfil the requirements of the Book of Common Prayer, and things would be very different. What an inducement to be true to our principles and the position in which we find ourselves, and what a lesson as to the kind of work we have to do, if we would labour with any hope of success for the reunion of Christendom!

Meanwhile, whether God grants such a consummation or not, whether in our time we see Jerusalem rebuilt or no, our duty is plain—it is summed up in the one word ‘Work.’ ‘Be strong . . . and work, for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts.’

Let us indeed labour for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, not expecting to see the result of our labours, but content, if God shows us His work, that He should reveal to our children His glory, not discouraged because one sows and another reaps, not tempted to despair if things go wrong, and all the world seems against us. Failure and disappointment in the Christian dispensation are the necessary steps to success; they are sent, not to dishearten, but to encourage us to fresh exertion.

What can be so near the heart of our Lord as the peace of His Church? What so good for men as fellowship in the same Communion? Think what a united Christendom would mean. What it might do for the glory and satisfaction of God, for the happiness of the human race, for the defence of the truth, for the battle against sin, for the spread of the Gospel throughout the world. Let us put away our selfishness, our worldliness, our miserable contentment with just the few things which seem to touch ourselves. Let us look up: let us look forward; let us realise our brotherhood with all men, our unity in Christ; let us implore our Lord Jesus Christ to give us hearts to love, to fill us with desires of peace, to help us in our work for unity. Let us do our best to turn the water of this world—its divisions, its envyings, its emulations,

its strifes—into the wine of the Gospel. Let us seek that peace, that charity, that single heart and mind which is the mark of Christ's followers. Let us remember that the greater the difficulties, the greater the glory of overcoming them, and the greater the joy, if by the mercy of God we attain to the rest of Paradise, of looking back upon them from the place where the departed do rest from their labours, and their works do follow them. Great indeed will be our joy in that day when the books are open and everything small and great is brought up for the judgment of God, if we are given a place among the company of those who, in their several generations, have striven to promote the peace of the Church, and are counted worthy to hear those words addressed to themselves: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.'

APPENDIX I

EXTRACTS from letters (a), (b), (c), (d) written to the Abbé Portal in 1897, referring to subjects treated in the correspondence, and dealing with the Vindication of English Ordinations sent by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII. ; (e) Extracts from letters written to Lady Halifax from Rome, June 1903.

Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal

(a)

J'ai vu l'évêque de Londres (notre ami de Peterborough) hier au soir et je lui ai demandé si la lettre de nos archevêques paraîtrait bientôt. Il m'a dit qu'il hâtait la chose autant qu'il pouvait, mais que l'archevêque de Canterbury ¹ était si occupé qu'il ne savait pas trop quand la lettre serait complètement finie ; il espère qu'elle ne tardera pas beaucoup.

(b)

Si la lettre de nos évêques dit des vérités un peu dures je ne serai pas mécontent. Enfin, mon cher ami, tout passe sauf l'amitié : un de ces jours on verra que nous avons raison. Pour le moment, je mets tout de côté, et je me rappelle seulement votre amitié et tous les bons amis de Paris et d'ailleurs que je vous dois. Il me semble qu'il y a des victoires qui sont pires que des défaites. Les affaires, même les affaires de l'Eglise, ne vont pas toujours comme on le souhaite, et il faut se dire bien souvent que tout vient à point qui sait attendre. . . .

(c)

Vous pouvez tranquilliser complètement ce cher M. Tavernier ² que j'aime tant. Aussitôt que la Bulle fut publiée, je me dis

¹ The Most Rev. Frederick Temple, consecrated Bishop of Exeter 1869, translated to London 1885, translated to Canterbury on the death of Archbishop Benson, 1896, enthroned 8th January 1897.

² M. Tavernier had been afraid that things might be said in England which might injure the Abbé Portal.

qu'il fallait parler une fois, et, cela fait, que tout m'imposait le silence. Aussi, je me suis promis de ne plus rien dire et de ne plus rien écrire. Qu'on dise ce qu'on veut, je laisserai tout faire et tout dire sans réplique. C'est la seule position qui nous convienne. On ne perd rien dans de telles circonstances par le silence ; mais quel que soit le résultat d'une telle conduite c'est la seule qui me convienne, et je me laisserais brûler vif plutôt que d'entrer en controverse avec tout ce monde là. Ils ont gagné une victoire complète ; nous sommes battus sur toute la ligne ; qu'ils se réjouissent donc de leur victoire, qu'ils passent en triomphe sur nos corps, c'est leur droit, qu'ils en usent ; mais au moins ils n'auront pas la satisfaction de nous faire parler.

(d)

Le livre ¹ du père Ragey m'arrive, et je l'ai lu d'un trait. Qu'il est peu Chrétien ! Et comme c'est triste qu'on puisse dénaturer les choses à un tel point ! Ce livre justifie tout ce que nous avons quelquefois pensé du cardinal et de son entourage. Quand on juge les autres d'une telle façon, ne voyant que des intrigues et des motifs égoïstes dans tout ce qui a été fait par amour de Notre Seigneur et des âmes, on se juge soi-même, et de la manière la plus sévère. Nous avons travaillé pour l'union, uniquement pour fortifier l'Eglise anglicane ! Nous avons demandé la reconnaissance de nos Ordres afin de mieux établir l'anglicanisme en face de Rome ! C'est une diplomatie habile, astucieuse, qui a inspiré mes relations avec vous, avec vous, mon cher ami, que j'aime tant, et à qui je n'ai jamais rien caché ! Tout ce que nous avons essayé se fonde d'un côté, le mien, sur la fourberie, car vraiment c'est là que le père Ragey aboutit—et de l'autre, le vôtre, sur une simplicité qui mérite d'être qualifiée d'une autre façon. Je laisse tout cela, mais un de ces jours on se servira du contenu de ce livre et surtout de la préface du cardinal. Pour le moment, vous avez raison, il faut négliger tout cela. Evidemment ce n'est pas le père Ragey qui a trouvé tout ce que contient son livre. C'est un exposé assez naïf des vues du cardinal et vraiment cela ne le flatte pas trop. Est-il possible d'avoir agi avec moins de cet esprit de charité et d'amour qui, après tout, est la plus grande sagesse. Notre but et toute notre politique étaient d'amener les esprits à reconnaître les justes droits de Rome. On avait fait déjà énormément de

¹ A book dealing with the events of which the account is given in this correspondence, to which Cardinal Vaughan had written a Preface.

chemin dans cette voie, et toute la politique du cardinal fut d'entraver ce que nous faisions et de rendre le rapprochement de l'Eglise anglicane avec Rome plus éloigné que jamais. Un prêtre français que j'ai vu l'autre jour me disait à propos de cette politique du cardinal : 'Quelle sottise ! comme si St. Pierre s'était mis à pêcher à la ligne ; il préférerait le filet, lui, mais votre cardinal veut prendre les poissons un à un.' On jugera le cardinal comme il le mérite un de ces jours. On jugera aussi le Pape qui n'a pas compris qu'on ne peut pas suivre deux lignes de conduite à la fois, on le jugera surtout parce qu'il a entrevu qu'il y avait autre chose à faire et qu'il n'a pas su continuer dans cette route. C'était une grande occasion et il l'a manquée. Mais, c'est encore trop tôt d'insister sur ce qu'on a fait fausse route. Il faut laisser aux événements le soin de donner la leçon, et attendre le bon moment, qui n'est pas encore venu, pour l'appuyer. Autant qu'on peut juger ce qui s'est fait, le résultat de la Bulle a été : (1) de détruire tout ce que nous faisions pour attirer les esprits à envisager d'une manière favorable les droits de l'Eglise romaine ; (2) de fortifier la position de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, et de donner des forces précisément à ceux que le cardinal Vaughan voulait affaiblir. Ce qu'on dit de tous les côtés ici c'est que la chose importante n'est pas la Bulle du Pape, mais la réponse des archevêques anglais,¹ et la manière dont la Bulle a été reçue ; elles prouvent que les Anglais sont en accord avec la doctrine catholique au sujet de la Présence réelle, et du Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, et se séparent définitivement de l'enseignement protestant sur ces sujets. Qu'on dise cela dans tous les journaux et que le parti protestant le proclame à haute voix, c'est un gain énorme.

Le désir pour l'union ne diminue pas ; seulement on se sent découragé, et il me semble qu'il faudra beaucoup de temps pour oublier la mauvaise impression produite par les deux derniers documents émanant de Rome.

I saw Leo XIII. again on the 5th of June 1903. It was for the last time ; he died on the 20th July, six weeks later.

I had gone to Rome expressly for the purpose of obtaining, if it were possible, an audience with the Pope. Seven years had elapsed since the issue of the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, much that was obscure then had become plain and I wished in some way to express to Leo XIII. and to Cardinal

¹ The reply of the Archbishops was sent to Leo XIII. early in March 1897.

Rampolla that despite all that had occurred, and the failure of what had been attempted, I was not ungrateful for all they had desired to do in the interests of reunion, or unmindful of all that had been begun with the Pope's blessing, encouraged during its progress by his support, and which, for a moment, had seemed likely, under his auspices, to lead to such momentous results. I also earnestly desired to ask the Pope for his blessing on any continuation of the work for reunion with which I had been associated, should a resumption of that work be possible in the future. That work was one which, perhaps, only a Pope of comparative youth and in full vigour of life could have undertaken with any hope of success, and Leo XIII. had long passed the allotted age of man when he attempted to deal with a situation of the greatest difficulty, and complicated by circumstances outside his own personal experience, which nothing but a determination hardly to be expected at his age, and a knowledge he did not possess, could have enabled him to control and guide to a successful issue. It was small wonder that meeting with difficulties he could not have anticipated, and lacking the support he had every reason to expect, he should have failed to surmount obstacles that might well have baffled a younger man. That he had some reason to complain of the way he had been treated, none, I think, who know the circumstances can doubt. Recalling these things, remembering his goodness to me and mine, my whole heart went out towards him, and in the thought of what he had wished and attempted, the failure of that attempt, the pain and disappointments of the past were all forgotten.

My wish was fulfilled. The Pope granted me an audience and I received from his own lips his renewed blessing on that work which all my life has been nearest my heart, the work of being allowed to contribute something towards healing the schism between England and Rome, and bringing back into one visible communion the scattered members of Christ's flock.

The following letter speaks for itself :—

(e)

Lord Halifax to Lady Halifax

HÔTEL CONTINENTAL,
ROME, June 4, 1903.

I arrived here yesterday morning, and went at once to see Mgr. Glorieux, who lives in the Lazarist House in the Via S. Nicola da Tolentino. Mgr. Glorieux was out. He has just been named a Canon of Sta. Maria Maggiore, and had gone to the office there, but I saw the Superior, also a friend of the Abbé's, and with him I had a good deal of talk. The best time to see Cardinal Rampolla would be at the Ave Maria, at 8 P.M. The Pope was '*un peu fatigué*,' and he doubted about my audience; he thought I should call on Mgr. Bisletti, the Mæstro di Camera at the Vatican, I should find him at four o'clock; Mgr. Mourey I should find in the afternoon; Mgr. Glorieux would be in at one, and I had better come back and see him then. He gave a most deplorable account of things in France: the Lazarists would be turned out of all their houses, except the Mother house at Paris, deprived of their Seminaries, and all that would be left them would be the privilege of getting themselves martyred in China. What an abominable tyranny it is, to be sure!

From him I went off to Mgr. Mourey. Mgr. Mourey was not well, but would perhaps be able to see me in the afternoon. Meanwhile, I saw Mgr. d'Hautpoul who lives with him. We talked about everything under the sun, the Emperor of Germany's visit to the Pope, our King's visit: the Emperor with all his carriages and cuirassiers had driven past their windows on his way to the Vatican, the French Ambassador had been there to see him pass, the Roman crowd delighted, some even cried when he got near St. Peter's, 'Long life to the new Charlemagne.' You can guess how the French liked that. Every one at the Vatican very pleased, a pleasure which was not diminished by the consciousness of the annoyance at the Quirinal (the King of Italy, they said, was furious). The visit was also a distraction, and dotted the 'i's' of the Pope's imprisonment at the Vatican—an imprisonment which, however voluntary, is obviously a necessity if the protest against the Italian occupation of Rome is to be maintained. They say the Emperor made himself very agreeable, and that the Pope was pleased. As for our King, the contrast of his visit was great,

'just a red arm to be seen *dans un carrosse défraîchi*, and 2500 lire given to the poor instead of the 10,000 given by the Emperor.' 'Il semblait que l'Empereur faisait trop, et que le Roi d'Angleterre faisait trop peu.' Still, the King's visit was a success, and pleased the Pope and his entourage very much. After going to the Vatican, the Emperor carried the King of Italy off to Monte Casino. He was most gracious to the monks, and the King was put quite in the second place. Queen Margherita, however, '*qui est une fine mouche*,' went off to Monte Casino on her own account as soon as the Emperor was gone, '*et sauva la maison de Savoie*.' Don't you see the situation? Then we talked about the Abbé Loisy, and the Commission on Biblical studies, about France, about Archbishop Ireland, Mgr. O'Connell, Archbishop Keane, and all the American difficulties. I forgot to say that I had previously been to the Palazzo Farnese, but that Mgr. Duchesne was out, and would not be visible till the afternoon.

After my *déjeuner* I went back to Mgr. Glorieux. He is very desponding about France, but hoped and believed that a Christian revival was preparing everywhere. He thought this, because everywhere the general unsettlement was such that, though evidently there were bad days to be got through, all that was happening seemed to be paving the way for a revival, when Christians would perhaps be fewer, but whose who were Christians would be Christians indeed.

In France it was a '*véritable Terreur*' which was preparing, and the feeling there was not unlike that in 1870, when every one who cared for France was ready to make any sacrifice for the sake of the country. It was the same now, with those who cared for religion. He talked much of the social question, saying it was in solving that question that the Church would have her great opportunity.

Then we talked about my doings. I was certainly to see Mgr. Bisletti, and Cardinal Ferrata, also Cardinal Vives y Tuto, a Spaniard, a member of the Commission on English Orders.

In the afternoon I went back to the Palazzo Farnese. This time I found Mgr. Duchesne at home. He was very outspoken in his talk—*que le Pape avait bonne volonté*, but lacked the determination, or the courage, to carry it out. As to the reunion of the Churches, it was obvious that if anything was to be done, there must be *des concessions de chaque côté*, that the Pope should have foreseen the opposition of the English Roman Catholics

and Cardinal Vaughan, and that steps should have been taken to induce the latter to carry out the Pope's wishes in England, that this ought to have been done in the first instance, but that it was the same with other things. There was great discontent, he added, even in regard to the Pope himself, 'et quand il serait mort, il y aurait une réaction formidable, un véritable déchaînement contre lui et contre sa politique,' that most Popes might be excused, because they were at the head of affairs for so short a time, but that this Pope had named every Cardinal except, I think he said, one, and might, if he had had more persistency of purpose, have done really great things, 'des inspirations de génie mais qui n'aboutissaient pas.' He was very amusing about the Emperor, and very interesting about the Commission on Biblical Criticism, but did not think it would do much, at least, for some time.

From Mgr. Duchesne I went to the Vatican, and saw Mgr. Bisletti.

Next I sat for an hour with Mgr. Mourey, who talked about everything under the sun : of Americanism, of all the difficulties in connection with Archbishop Ireland, Mgr. O'Connell, Archbishop Keane, etc., of the attempt to get Archbishop Ireland made a Cardinal, of the Archbishop's enemies, and of what had happened in connection with his celebrated speech about the temporal power.

'Et bien, monseigneur, lui dit le Pape, devant un certain nombre de cardinaux, si vous aviez à défendre la thèse du pouvoir temporel devant une audience américaine, comment vous y prendriez-vous ? Figurez-vous que nous sommes votre auditoire. L'Archevêque s'exécuta (un piège, non de la part du Pape mais des ennemis de l'archevêque), et tout était dit.'

Mgr. O'Connell, who had been in disgrace, has been righted, and is now head of the Washington University. Mgr. Keane had also been in trouble, but has had justice done him, and has been made an Archbishop.

Mgr. Mourey also talked about the social movement in Italy, and the connection of the clergy with it : how different the situation was in France, where the parochial clergy had no canonical status, and were often moved by the bishops to another parish after six or seven years. How was it possible, he asked, for clergy in such a position to put themselves at the head of banks, co-operative institutions, and such other social efforts, often involving difficulties with other interests, when the

moment everything was in train they might be moved elsewhere ? I thought he talked a great deal of sense on the subject, and yet the social question is one of the questions that most wants solving. I understood him to say that the insurrection in Milan, which happened three or four years ago, might have been very serious. (You will remember a priest named Albertario, who was supposed to be mixed up in it, and who was sent to prison, where he either died, or died shortly after he was released.) The insurrection, Mgr. Mourey had reason to believe, only failed because it exploded three days too soon. It was said the Government had obtained and altered some order of the Revolutionary Committee, and thus caused the premature explosion, and that the murder of King Humbert was the revenge taken by the secret societies for the sanguinary way the insurrection was put down.

After dinner I went to the Vatican to see Cardinal Rampolla.

‘ Ah, Lord Halifax, comme je suis content de vous voir, etc., etc.’ We had quite a pleasant talk about the King’s visit and the reception of the banished Religious Orders in England. The Pope was *fatigué*, but he hoped would be able to see me on Friday. There was no possibility for to-morrow (Thursday). I had a long talk to the Cardinal, and did not get away until past nine.

This morning I went to Mass at seven at Sta. Maria degli Angeli (the Baths of Diocletian), and then found Albert¹ at his hotel. He is to go with me to see Cardinal Rampolla to-night, and the Cardinal was to ask for an audience. I suggested this, and that if I went he should go with me.

After seeing Albert, I went to see Cardinal Ferrata. He was Nuncio at Paris for some time, and knew the Abbé Portal well. He was more than friendly, very kind about myself, and said he had wished to make my acquaintance. He then went on to say that the day would come when the seed sown (reunion) would grow and bear fruit ; that it was of the first importance to bring people into contact with one another, and that it was an important thing to go on repeating things which were good and true, even though they might be unpopular, because the mere fact of repeating them accustomed people to them, and facilitated their accomplishment. It was a battle everywhere between belief and atheism, and it would be a great force and on the right side, and to the advantage both of Rome

¹ Fourth Earl Grey, later Governor-General of Canada.

and England, if the Churches could be reunited, etc. etc. He impressed me very much, though he was not the least like what I had expected. The Pope, he thought, would do nothing against the French Republic, but would not receive M. Loubet if he came to Rome. He added that, despite every possible *ménagement*, things would get worse in France, and that, in his opinion, there were bad times coming for the Catholics in that country.

ROME, *Friday, June 5th.*

To continue my letter of yesterday, in which I forgot to tell you that after seeing Mgr. Bisletti¹ at the Vatican, I went for a moment into St. Peter's. It was looking its very best. You know I sometimes think the first impression of St. Peter's disappointing. It is only when one has been in it a short time, unless one happens to have gone in when it is growing dark, that one begins to realise its immensity, but yesterday the nave and choir were all hung with red damask for Whitsuntide. Curtains were drawn across all the windows except those in the transepts, and though perfectly light, there was a subdued effect, a cool shade compared with the heat outside and the streaks of bright sunlight in the transept, that was most striking. The church seemed quite illimitable, magnificent, but not the least gaudy, and then—for the Quarant'ore were going on—there were many lights at the High Altar, above the usual twinkling lamps round the 'Confession,' and descent into the Crypt, with people praying, some coming, some going, and all, in a most devout and religious silence. It was wonderful,—a sight not to be forgotten.

But to go back. Our visit to Cardinal Rampolla went off very well. Albert pleased him by saying what an admirable work the Jesuits were doing for education in Rhodesia, and also what excellent people the Dominican nuns were, and how much they were beloved by natives and Europeans alike. Then we had a little talk about the King's Declaration, which the Cardinal very truly said was not worthy of England's general attitude towards the religious convictions of some of the King's most loyal subjects; and after some expressions on our part of the honour we felt it to be received by the Pope (did I tell you that I had asked the Cardinal to include Albert in my audience, and that I had had a letter late that afternoon to say the Pope would

¹ Maestro di Camera, since Nuncio at Vienna.

receive us at twelve o'clock on Friday, to-morrow ?), we came away, the Cardinal saying some kind things about me, of the good impression he had received from our former intercourse in 1895, and that we ought to come back and spend a winter in Rome.

Friday morning was fine. I went to Mass again at Sta. Maria degli Angeli, and then started off to find Cardinal Vives y Tuto, who was living at the Casa dei Capucini in the Via Buoncompagni. He received me at once, and was very cordial, saying how glad he was to make my acquaintance. He went on to speak of England, of the important place England occupied in regard to all missionary enterprise, of her friendliness to all missionaries and of the good feeling which existed between Anglican and Catholic missionaries abroad. How much might be done for the spread of the Gospel if the divisions of Christendom could be healed. That we must work and pray, and that 'petit à petit' things would improve. Already, he added, there was a great diminution of prejudice on all sides, and that, 'vu la position de l'Angleterre,' there was much to inspire the hope and the belief that she might be a great instrument for good in God's hands. He, too, asked if I often came to Rome, and said I ought to come back, and spend some time there, and try and see different people. The person he was like to look at was Canon Body,¹ with very much his manner, and producing the same effect of recollectedness and living in the presence of God.

From the Cardinal I went back to Albert, and we went together to see the General of the Jesuits, Albert wishing to thank him for the work of the Society in Rhodesia. The General was absolutely engaged, but sent down the Assistant-General, an American, with whom we had much talk. It was a happy topic in view of the way the Jesuits are now being treated in France: Albert talked of their industrial schools and other work, and said how much they deserved help and encouragement. Then he amused me by expatiating to the Assistant-General on what had been the turning-point in Cecil Rhodes's life—his reading Ignatius Loyola's *Life*, and of the desire he had entertained to found a secret order modelled on the Jesuit rule, the members of which should be vowed to obedience, and devoted to the one object of furthering by all means in their power the interests of the British Empire. The Assistant-General must

¹ The Rev. George Body, canon-missioner of Durham; died 1911.

have been more than human if he did not draw a contrast between Ignatius Loyola and the Kingdom of God on one side, and Cecil Rhodes and the British Empire on the other !

There was just time between the Jesuits and dressing to go to the Vatican, to look at some of the newly-discovered statues in the Museum, which now occupies the old Carthusian House at Santa Maria degli Angeli ; and then we hurried off to get ready for our audience.

The Pope was more than kind, and struck me as hardly altered since he received us in 1895. The expression of his face was perhaps softer and more gentle, but his eyes were as bright and quick as ever. It was a great pleasure seeing him again. Albert and I were one on each side of his chair. He said he was very glad to see me ; that he remembered my former visit some years ago, and '*le bon souvenir qu'il avait pour moi.*' I said how much I had desired to see His Holiness again, and the honour I esteemed it to have been granted an audience. The Pope then spoke of the regard he had for England, of his appreciation of English justice and liberality, of the pleasure the King's visit had given him, that he had been able to tell the King of his having seen and been presented to Queen Victoria when he was Nuncio at Brussels, and how he had afterwards seen the Queen in London. He also mentioned that the Queen, when she had been at Florence, had sent one of her ladies to inquire after his health, which had evidently pleased him.

I then said Lord Grey had been Administrator in Rhodesia, and that he wanted to tell His Holiness of the admirable work the Jesuits were doing for education in that country. The Pope replied that he was aware of Lord Grey's connection with South Africa, after which Albert told him how much the Jesuits and the Dominican nuns were doing, and how grateful the Rhodesian Government was to them for their self-denying labours. '*Vous me faites beaucoup de plaisir, M. Grey,*' the Pope said, '*beaucoup de plaisir. je suis très content.*' And then, after a little more conversation, something was said about the King's Declaration, and that Albert was charged with a '*projet de loi*' in the House of Lords for its abolition. Albert explained that he was in communication with the Duke of Norfolk, and had promised to introduce a Bill on the subject. '*C'est très bien,*' said the Pope, '*ce n'est pas digne de l'Angleterre de qualifier comme idolâtres*' some of the King's most loyal subjects, that he was '*content, et qu'il fallait continuer,*' etc. After a little

more in this sense, I said, 'Que j'avais beaucoup voulu entendre encore quelques mots encourageants de la bouche de Sa Sainteté pour la réunion des Eglises.' 'Mais, c'est mon rêve,' said the Pope, 'ce que je désire le plus.' He went on to emphasize his desire for reunion, and all that he had wished to do to promote it. That it was above all things necessary to pray for it, 'de prier beaucoup, que notre Seigneur n'avait fondé qu'une Eglise, pas plusieurs'; that He had conferred certain rights on Peter, and that we must all pray that what was God's will, not our own, might be fulfilled, and our Lord's prayer that there should be one fold, one Shepherd, realised. He repeated again, 'qu'il fallait persévérer et prier, surtout prier, et prier beaucoup.' He then said something which I did not quite catch, something about 'un rapprochement' and 'les cérémonies de l'Eglise,' then something friendly and paternal to me, 'de la bonne impression qu'il avait de M. Halifax qui se rapprochait de nous, et qu'il espérait voir venir plus près.' He laid his hand on my shoulder as he said this, with a sort of suggestion that I was a link, and occupied a position of my own in regard to reunion. He then asked if we often came to Rome, repeating more than once 'qu'il fallait revenir pour quelque temps.' I then asked, would the Holy Father give me his blessing, extending it to the objects I had at heart, and as I knelt before him he put his hand on my head and gave me a long blessing in Latin. You will understand what it meant to me, not only in regard to the past, but still more in regard to the future.

I think Albert was as much impressed as I was, though he had not my reasons for being moved. We then paid our visit to Cardinal Rampolla, who asked if we were 'content,' how we thought the Pope looking, and then, after he had added something to the effect 'qu'il nous engageait de revenir à Rome bientôt, et y passer quelque temps,' we made our adieux. I thought the Cardinal looking well, and I was very glad to see him again.

I then called on Mgr. Gasparri, with whom I had some talk. He is a member of a Congregation which has to do with special matters relating to foreign affairs. I sat with him some little time, his apartments are on the opposite side of the Court of the Vatican, though on the same floor as those of Cardinal Rampolla. He also was very friendly, and seeing him revived many memories.

I had luncheon with Albert at the Grand Hotel. Donna Maria

Grazioli Lanti and her husband, Frank Bertie¹ (the English Ambassador) making up the party, and very pleasant it was. Later I had a visit from Mgr. Stonor,² the Archbishop of Trebizond. We leave Rome this evening.

Adieu till to-morrow.

¹ Hon. Francis Leveson Bertie, second son of Montagu, sixth Earl of Abingdon. Ambassador at Rome, 1903-1904. Since Ambassador at Paris.

² Hon. Edmund Stonor, third son of Thomas, third Lord Camoys, Canon of St. John Lateran, and Archbishop of Trebizond.

APPENDIX II

EXTRACTS from :

- (a) Bossuet on the Sacrifice of the Mass.
- (b) Letter from the Abbé Portal in reference to the preceding.
- (c) Sermon by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newport, on the same subject, delivered in May 1908.
- (d) Bishop Challoner's *Meditations for Every Day in the Year*.
- (e) Cardinal Newman on the Real Presence.
- (f) Dr. Pusey—Letter to the author of *The Christian Year*, on the meaning of the term 'Transubstantiation.'
- (g) Two verses from the well-known and popular hymn by the late Rev. W. Bright, D.D.

(a)

Bossuet

Il est certain qu'il y a sacrifice dans la Messe. Ce sacrifice est mystique ou sacramentel puisque Notre Seigneur s'offre sous les espèces du pain et du vin. Ce sacrifice sacramentel ou mystique est réel puisque Notre Seigneur est réellement présent dans les espèces du pain et du vin, puisque nous voyons le corps sous les espèces du pain, le sang sous les espèces du vin. Etant admis que le vin est le sang, que le pain est le corps, nous avons la séparation des deux pour nos yeux, non pas comme sur la croix où la séparation était *in rebus ipsis*, mais mystiquement ou sacramentellement *in signis ipsis*. Ce sacrifice mystique est aussi réel que le sacrifice de la croix. C'est là son corps, c'est là le sang ; ils sont séparés, oui, séparés : le corps d'un côté, le sang de l'autre : la parole a été l'épée, le couteau tranchant qui a fait cette séparation mystique. . . . Pour imprimer sur ce Jésus qui ne meurt plus, le caractère de la mort qu'il a véritablement souffert, la parole vient, qui met le corps d'un

côté, le sang de l'autre, et chacun sous des signes différents. Le voilà donc revêtu du caractère de sa mort ce Jésus autrefois notre victime par l'effusion de son sang, et encore aujourd'hui notre victime d'une manière nouvelle, par la séparation mystique de ce sang d'avec ce corps.

(b)

Letter from the Abbé Portal in reference to an observation of mine in regard to the preceding passage from Bossuet :—

Vous le faites remarquer avec juste raison : ce qui a perdu certains théologiens c'est d'avoir recherché à tout prix une destruction de la victime *in specie propria* comme le dit Billot,¹ c'est-à-dire, dans la personne même de Notre Seigneur, alors qu'il faut rechercher ici le sacrifice *in specie aliena*, dans le pain et le vin.

Cette remarque et cette distinction me paraissent nécessaires. Je suis convaincu que le cardinal Vaughan et ceux qui l'entourent donnent à l'opinion de Franzelin et de de Lugo trop d'importance. En réalité si on admet la Présence réelle objective, il est impossible de ne pas tomber d'accord sur l'existence du sacrifice. Et ce qui fait la force de votre position c'est que, même dans vos plus mauvais jours, vous avez eu des hommes qui ont admis la Présence réelle et qui ont protesté contre le sacrifice. Ils ont donc protesté contre quelque chose qui ne découlait pas nécessairement de la Présence réelle.

De la Présence réelle peut aussi se déduire l'opinion connue sous les noms de Franzelin et de de Lugo, car il est bien vrai que Notre Seigneur perd quelque chose dans sa présence sacramentelle puisque il est là sans quantité, mais cette explication d'esprits théologiques éminents n'était probablement pas celle des théologiens que les vôtres combattaient. En tout cas, même l'explication de de Lugo porte l'esprit à trop considérer l'acte d'abaissement de Notre Seigneur et le pousse à y rechercher instinctivement une source propre de mérites.

(c)

The Bishop of Newport :—

The sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, to all Christian minds, to all Christian thought, in every aspect of the Christian dispensation, historically, devotionally, practically, are full, com-

¹ Member of the Society of Jesus, Professor at the Roman College, now Cardinal.

plete, and superabundant. . . . His suffering completely atoned for man's offence against God, and purchased all necessary grace for every human being. He is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. For faithful and unbeliever, for the elect and the non-elect. His blood has made satisfaction. For original sin, for actual sin, and for all the punishment due to sin, He has cancelled the account that was against us, nailing it to His Cross.

(d)

Extract from Bishop Challoner's ¹ *Meditations* :—

I

Consider that this great Sacrifice of the Eucharist essentially consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and in the offering up of the same Body and Blood to God by the ministry of the priest, as a perpetual memorial of the sacrifice of the Cross, and a continuation of the same to the end of the world. For, by the separate consecration of the bread into the Body of Christ, and of the wine into His Blood, performed by the priest, in the name and person of Christ, our great High Priest, Christ Jesus, presents Himself to His Father upon our altars, as slain for us, and under this figure of death, offers up His own Body and Blood, to answer all the ends and intentions for which we ought to offer sacrifice to God. Not as if there were any deficiency, or insufficiency in the sacrifice of the Cross, by which He completely redeemed us, and opened to us the fountain of all mercy, grace and salvation, but that we might have in this Eucharistic Sacrifice a standing memorial of our redemption, a daily means of applying the fruit of it to our souls, a daily communion one with another, by joining together in the solemn worship of sacrifice as the children of God had always done from the beginning, and daily means of uniting ourselves in these mysteries with our High Priest and Victim, Jesus Christ, and of coming to God with Him and through Him.

II

Consider that as this sacrifice [the Sacrifice of the Altar] has an

¹ Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner, D.D., Bishop of Debra, Vicar-Apostolic for the London District—obliged to leave London on the occasion of the Gordon Riots. Died 1781. Author of the well-known manual, *The Garden of the Soul*.

especial relation to the Passion and Death of the Son of God . . . as our Saviour Himself here officiates in person and acts, as in a sacred tragedy, his whole Passion and Death, we ought to accompany Him in this action, with suitable affection and devotion. Had we been present, with a true belief in Him, when He was offering upon the Cross the sacrifice of our redemption, with what sentiments of love and gratitude, with what deep sense of sorrow and repentance for our sins, with what fervour of devotion, should we have waited upon Him there, meditating upon His infinite goodness and love for us, manifested in His Passion, and on the heinous enormity of our sins, which could not be expiated but with His sacred blood ? With the like sentiments of devotion ought we to assist at this solemn memorial, and representation of His Passion in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Consider that as often as we assist at this Sacrifice, we are not only to commemorate, by meditation, the Passion and Death of the Son of God, but also to take along with us, as it were, to God the Father, His Son, slain for us, and His precious blood shed for us, and this in such a manner as to offer up ourselves also to Him, with the whole Church, which is the mystical body of His Son, by His hands, and in union with the offering which He, Who is our Head, there makes of Himself. We are also, at the same time, to join our intentions with His, as He is our chief Priest, and principal Offerer, and with those of the whole people of God, according to the four great ends of the Sacrifice, going as it were in a body, with Jesus Christ at our head, and with Him, we are to offer adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to God, and to pray and beg mercy through Him, both for ourselves and for all the world.

(c)

In a letter addressed to the Rev. Godfrey Faussett, D.D., on the 22nd June 1838, Cardinal Newman had said :—

The Roman Church, we know, considers that the elements of bread and wine depart or are taken away on Consecration, and that the Body and Blood of Christ take their place. This is the doctrine of Transubstantiation ; and in consequence they hold that what is seen, felt, and tasted is not Bread and Wine, but

Christ's Flesh and Blood, though the former look, feel, and taste remains.

In 1877 he republished what he had formerly written, with corrections, and upon this passage he says : ' This is not accurate ' (*vid. supr. note, p. 224*).

The following are among the passages referred to in the above note :—

Bellarm. col. 580.—Corpus Christi (dicitur) videri, tangi, frangi, et teri, mediantibus speciebus panis.

Billuart, p. 357, col. 1.—Non Corpus Christi propriè manducatur, sed species manducantur.

Bellarm., col. 351.—Christus in Eucharistia modum existendi corporum non habet, sed potius spirituum.

So also in a note on p. 220 :—

(The Catholic doctrine is as follows : . . . Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the Sacrament. He is present in the Sacrament only in substance, *substantivé*, and substance does not require or imply the occupation of place. But if place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental Presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord then neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how ; we have no parallel to the ' how ' in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His Presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental ; an absolute mystery, not against reason, however, but against imagination, and must be received by faith.) See *Via Media*, vol. ii. Ed. 1877.

These passages are interesting, first, as showing how Cardinal Newman (as an Anglican) had misunderstood the teaching of the Roman Church on the subject of Tran-

substantiation; and secondly, as witnessing to what that doctrine really is.¹

(f)

Cf. Dr. Pusey, *An Eirenicon, In a Letter to the Author of 'The Christian Year'* (Ed. 1865, p. 64) :—

With regard to the term 'Transubstantiation,' there must be a real difference between the meaning which it had in the minds of the Schoolmen, and that which it must now have since the Catechism of the Council of Trent. For it is there taught with authority that 'the Eucharist has been called bread, because it has the appearance, and still *retains* the quality, *natural* to bread, of supporting and nourishing'; but the Schoolmen thought, that with the 'change of substance' that power of nourishing ceased. Yet this being granted, I know not what can be included in our term 'substance,' which the English Church affirms to remain, which is not also included in the Roman term 'accidents,' which they also affirm to remain. Clearly the doctrine which the Church of England rejects under the term 'Transubstantiation, or the change of the *substance* of bread and wine,' is only one which 'overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,' in that the sign and the thing signified became the same. This was so, according to the doctrine of the Schoolmen, in which 'substance' was equivalent to 'matter.' The meaning of the word 'substance' being changed, the Roman doctrine must be so far changed too.²

(g)

The following verses are from the hymn by the late Rev. Wm. Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford :—

And now, O Father, mindful of the love
That bought us, once for all, on Calvary's Tree,
And having with us Him that pleads above,
We here present, we here spread forth to Thee

¹ Cf. also St. Thomas :—

'Nulla rei fit scissura :
Signi tantum fit fractura :
Qua nec status, nec statura
Signati minuitur.'

—Office for Corpus Christi.

² Cf. also Note by Rev. T. A. Lacey on meaning of Transubstantiation, p. 128.

That only Offering perfect in Thine eyes,
The one true, pure, immortal Sacrifice.

Look, Father, look on His Anointed Face,
And look only on us as found in Him ;
Look not on our misusings of Thy grace,
Our prayer so languid, and our faith so dim :
For lo ! between our sins and their reward
We set the Passion of Thy Son our Lord.

Can any one maintain, after reading these extracts, that the differences between Rome and England on the subject of the Sacrifice of the Mass are irreconcilable, and not such as are largely due to misunderstandings and, in the interests of reunion, susceptible of explanation ?

Would any theologian who can rightly claim the name of ' Evangelical,' deny that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper our Lord commands what He did at the Last Supper to be continued, that He instituted that Supper for the showing forth of His death till He comes again, that He identified the bread and wine with His Body and Blood, and that for the purpose of this ' showing forth ' the bread and wine sacramentally identified by His word with His Body and Blood are presented as such before His Father in memory of His Passion then beginning, and to be consummated on the Cross.

St. Thomas does not say differently in the Office for Corpus Christi :—

Quod in coena Christus gessit,
Faciendum hoc expressit,
In sui memoriam.

APPENDIX III

NOTE BY MR. WILFRID WARD referred to at p. 106.

(In publishing the following Memorandum at Mr. Ward's request, I must not be understood to accept it as conveying the impression of what at the time I had supposed Mr. Ward's attitude to be.)

WHEN I met the Abbé Portal at Hickleton in August 1894, I was engaged in writing that section of the *Life of Cardinal Wiseman* which concerns the agitation of 1841 among the Oxford Tract party, on behalf of reunion with Rome. I had been impressed by the fact that, whereas Cardinal Wiseman, almost alone among his co-religionists, treated that movement with the sympathy expressed in his well-known letter to Lord Shrewsbury, he was likewise mainly instrumental in bringing to the Catholic and Roman Church the distinguished group that entered it in 1845. Since that date, the spread of Catholic doctrine in the Church of England has been one of the remarkable phenomena of our time, and the reappearance in 1894 amongst its members of a desire for union with the Holy See appeared to me on this very account a fact of far greater importance than the similar symptoms in the 'forties. I thought that sympathy on our part with the desire for union would deepen and spread that desire, while a controversial or sarcastic attitude might easily destroy it. I was never sanguine, however, considering the strong anti-Roman feeling which still prevailed in the Church of England, that any decisive step towards reunion would be possible in our own day, and the first few months of the agitation proved that the desire, though intensely strong, was confined to only a few. I expressed my feeling as to the immediate prospect in an article called the 'Rigidity of Rome,' published in the *Nineteenth Century* of November 1895, in which I wrote thus :—

'It is tolerably evident that at the present hour there can be no direct approach to corporate reunion between Rome and any considerable section of Englishmen. The divergences and misconceptions are too deep and extensive.'

Yet I thought that something might be done. 'If,' I said, 'obstacles to reunion have obviously accumulated since the reign of James I., when so much of the Catholic *ethos* remained in the popular mind, may not the revival of Catholic sympathies gradually remove these obstacles?'

I had some hope that if Roman sympathies spread as much in the coming half century as Catholic doctrines in general had spread in the past half century, a close approximation between a large section of the Church of England and ourselves might be achieved, which, in some favourable crisis, might issue in the corporate union of that section with the Holy See. Disestablishment occurred to me as a conceivable occasion for such a result. Indeed disestablishment might lead to the secession of the Low Church party from the Church of England, and give to Lord Halifax's friends a far more representative position than they had in the existing established Church.

An attitude of sympathy on our part appeared to me quite compatible with avoiding any false suggestion as to what the Holy See could concede, and I myself reminded Lord Halifax in my letters from the first: (1) that no reunion would ever be possible except on the basis of the Vatican Decrees, though interpreted doubtless rather as Dupanloup would interpret them, than as Cardinal Manning would; (2) that it was essential that Rome should, before being asked formally to encourage the movement, be accurately informed as to how comparatively small was the section of members of the Established Church who at present desired reunion with the Holy See—this was a point on which Abbé Portal was himself, I think, under a not quite accurate impression; (3) that Rome could never simply acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders, and that conditional reordination in place of unconditional was the utmost concession she could ever make.

Cardinal Vaughan allowed me to talk the whole matter over with him quite freely. I thought that his policy was less likely to be helpful in promoting the movement than Cardinal Wiseman's, though he desired in his own way to show it sympathy. He thought, however, that controversy was called for to an extent which I considered would weaken a desire that needed strengthening. I disagreed also with his view that a formal condemnation of Anglican Orders would at once lead many to leave the Church of England. I believed, on the contrary, that it would turn away from all thought of Rome many more than it brought

nearer to us. I ventured to think that the Cardinal undervalued the importance of fostering and developing Roman sympathies with a view to the future. With much of this Lord Halifax, I think, was in accord. And both of us were anxious, apart from the question of possible future results from the movement, to carry on the discussion it raised in a spirit of fairness to both sides, and with as little as might be of the acrimony of party feeling.

This note is, I think, necessary to a true understanding of my letters to Lord Halifax, if only a few are printed in his book, though it would be unnecessary if a large selection were given ; for, taken as a whole, they speak for themselves.

INDEX

- Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.* See Forms of Ordination.
- Acton, Lord, reference to, 319.
- Agliardi, Mgr., Papal Nuncio to the Czar's Coronation, 246.
- Alaska, Russian Bishop of, his reception in England, 243.
- Aldrich, Bishop, retains his See under Edward vi. and Mary, 361.
- Andrews, Bishop, reference to, 184.
- Anglican Orders—
 Commission on, appointed by Leo XIII. (1896), 26, 28, 30, 271-274, 279, 284, 286, 290, 292, 293, 299, 301-303, 388-390.
 — Anglicans not officially represented, 28.
 — change in the character of, 28.
 — difficulty of ascertaining what actually took place, 28.
 — English Rite, question as to its full discussion by, 28, 29, 299, 300.
 — Members of, 26. See also under Proper Names.
- Condemnation of, in the Bull *Curæ Apostolicæ*, and its results, 31, 34-39, 277, 278, 348 n., 354-360, 368-382, 388-394.
 — Reply of English Archbishops to, 35, 369, 370, 376, 396, 423-424.
- Memorandum on, by Mr. Gladstone, 312-318.
- Recognition of, by Rome an absolute necessity for Reunion. See Reunion.
- See also Halifax, Lord, and Portal, the Abbé, efforts to bring about.
- Antioch, Church of, position of individual members after the Schism, 195.
- Apostolicæ Curæ*, the Bull of Leo XIII.—
 Condemnation of Anglican Orders by, 30, 31, 34-39, 277, 278, 348 n., 354-360, 368-382, 385-394.
- Apostolicæ Curæ*, the Bull of Leo XIII.—
 Discussion of, 368-382, 389, 390, 392-394, 397, 425.
 Vindication of, by Roman Bishops in England, 396.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas—
 View of the Essential Form in Ordination, 50, 393.
 View of the meaning of Transubstantiation, 128, 129 n., 442.
- Argyll, Bishop of (Haldane), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 189; on the Memorandum on Reunion, 221.
- Arian Heresy, reference to, 195.
- Armenian Church, *Decretum ad Armenos.* See Eugenius iv.
- Arras, Bishop of, Lord Halifax's interview with, 264.
- Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, 4, 5.
- Athanasian Creed, importance of, 404, 405.
- Augsburg, Confession of, reference to, 300.
- Azarian, Mgr., on the proceedings of Protestant missionaries in Armenia, 123.
- BAPTISM, Sacrament of, validity of Anglican rite, 388.
- Barcelona, letter from (M. Portal), 46.
- Barlow, Bishop—
 Case of, reference to, 82, 261, 292, 392 n.
 The Royal mandate, 82, 302.
- Barrington, Bishop, Charge by, 6.
- Basle, Council of, references to, 256.
- Bede, Ven., on the Episcopate of St. Chad, 81.
- Bellarmino, reference to, 76, 409.
- Benedict XIV., on the essential forms in Ordination, 75, 76, 152.
- Benson, A. C., reference to, 372.

- Benson, Edward White. *See* Canterbury, Archbishop of.
- Biarritz, letters from (Lord Halifax), 62.
- Biel, Gabriel, School of, 128 *n*.
- Birkbeck, W. J.—
Description of Lent Services at St. Petersburg, 77, 78.
— of the Czar's Coronation, 244-246.
- Halifax, Lord, and, acknowledgment of assistance given by, 3.
— — correspondence with, 77, 81, 161, 355 *n*.
— — visit to Rome with, 18, 19, 197, 202, 211.
Letter from Constantine Pobiédonostzeff to, 223, 304.
On the Russian Church, friendly attitude towards the Anglican Church, 77, 78, 82, 223, 241, 244, 304.
- Bishop, Edmund, reference to, 197, 198.
- Bishopthorpe, letter from (Lord Halifax), 359.
- Bisletti, Mgr., Lord Halifax's visit to, 428, 429, 431.
- Bonner, Bishop, view of Roman supremacy, 236.
- Bosahan, R S.O., letters from (Lord Halifax), 138.
- Bossuet—
General references, 155, 225, 256, 381.
On the Sacrifice of the Mass, 396, 436, 437.
- Botton, Dom Anselm, reference to, 418.
- Boudinhon, Abbé—
General references to, 24, 86, 95, 230, 240, 251, 257-261, 272, 322, 329 *n*., 393.
Interview with Lord Halifax, 257, 261.
- Bourret, Cardinal, letters on Reunion, references to, 13, 74, 76, 84, 85, 113, 229, 230.
- Bovey Tracey, letters from (Lord Halifax), 149, 151.
- Bramhall, Archbishop, on the Roman claim to supremacy, 23, 184, 232, 407.
- Brandi, Fr., Articles in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, 19 *n*., 201 *n*.
- Brechin, Bishops of—
(Forbes), *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, 410, 411; on the *Articles*, 4-6; *Considerationes Modestae*, 291.
(Jermyn), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 189.
- Bright, Rev. Canon W.—
General references, 268 *n*., 289, 372.
Hymn by, 441, 442.
Letters to Lord Halifax, 373, 375.
- Bristol—
Address on Reunion by Lord Halifax (1895), 163 *n*., 180-193, 205; Letters from English Bishops on, 187-193, 202.
Speech by Cardinal Vaughan at. *See* Vaughan.
- Brogie, Duc de, references to, 24, 63, 250, 272, 311.
- Browne, Canon G. Forrest, reference to, 161.
- Bulls, Papal. *See* under Names of Popes.
- Bute, Lord, on the ignorance of the Anglican Church among Roman Catholics, 10 *n*.
- Butler, Charles, *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics* by, 413.
- CABRERA, SEÑOR, invalid consecration of. *See* Dublin, Archbishop of, and the Toledo Correspondence.
- Cahors, letters from (M. Portal), 49, 50, 92, 130, 156.
- Cairo (Illinois), Bishop of, on Lord Halifax's Memorandum on Reunion, 222, 320-321.
- Canterbury, Archbishop of (Benson)—
Correspondence and interviews with Lord Halifax as to the informal overtures from Rome, 15-17, 21, 84, 124-125, 130-135, 137-138, 141-143, 156-158, 160, 165-166, 168, 177, 180, 193, 367-368.
— Position taken by, 16, 124, 137-138, 141-142, 178, 193, 202, 329, 386-388, 390.
— His refusal and its results as to Reunion, 142, 386-388. *See also* York, Archbishop of.
- Death of, 35, 376.
- Interviews with the Abbé Portal, 15, 18, 99-100, 123-125, 137-139, 181.
- Letters and speeches on Reunion, 22, 70 *n*., 169, 170, 224, 227-229; on the Encyclical *Ad Anglos*, 227-229.

- Canterbury, Archbishop of (Benson)—
Life of, by Canon Mason, references to, 124, 142, 165, 355 *n.*, 366 *n.*
 Memorandum by Lord Halifax and M. Portal to, 130, 132-135.
 Minor references to, 2, 3, 74, 83-85, 119, 129, 143-145, 166, 167, 175, 178, 221, 228, 243, 244, 365, 367, 370.
 Notes on *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 372.
 Reply of the English Archbishops to Leo XIII. *See* Leo XIII.
 Archbishop of (Temple). *See* Leo XIII., Reply of the English Archbishops.
 Cardinals, Commission of. *See* Holy Office.
 Carini, Fr., pamphlet on Mgr. Niccolo Ormaneto, 309, 413.
 Cartesian Category of Substance, 129.
 Ceconi, Mgr., *Histoire du Concile du Vatican*, reference to, 11, 155, 156.
 Cecil, Lady Gwendolen, on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 193; on the Memorandum on Reunion, 221.
 Chabot, Dr., reference to, 289.
 Challoner, Bishop, on the Sacrifice of the Mass, 438, 439.
 Chambers, Bishop, retains his See under Edward VI. and Mary, 361.
 Chester, Bishop of (Jayne), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 188.
 Church Congress at Norwich, 22, 230.
 Church, Dean, references to, 8, 259 *n.*
Church Times—
 Archbishop Benson's notes on *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 372.
 Lord Halifax's letter on Papal Primacy, 259 *n.*
 Cienfuegos, on the Sacrifice of the Mass, 236.
Civiltà Cattolica, articles in, 19 *n.*, 180, 201 *n.*
 Clement XI., decision in the Gordon case, 30 *n.*, 378.
 Clifton, Bishop of, general references, 292, 294, 295.
 Cobb, Gerald, the *Kiss of Peace*, by, reference to, 4, 56, 57, 59, 97, 156.
 Colchester, Bishop of, on Lord Halifax's Memorandum on Reunion, 222.
 Coleridge, S. T., reference to *Christabel*, 316.
 Commission on Anglican Orders. *See* Anglican Orders.
 Congress of Catholic theologians at Velehrad, Moravia (1907), 329 and 400 *nn.*
 Constance, Council of, 256.
 Convocation of Canterbury (1531), 316.
 Correspondence, the. *See under* Proper Names—
 Bright, Dr.; Birkbeck, W. J.; Cairo, Bishop of; Canterbury, Archbishop of; Denny, E.; Duchesne, M.; Gladstone, W. E.; Halifax, Lady; Halifax, Lord; Lacey, T. A.; Lake, W. C.; Lathbury, D. C.; Paget, F.; Parocchi, Cardinal; Peterborough, Bishop of; Phillimore, Sir W.; Pobiédonostzeff, C.; Portal, M.; Purcell, Mr.; Rampolla, Cardinal; Riley, A.; Salisbury, Bishop of; Toledo, Archbishop of; Vaughan, Cardinal; Wales, H. R. H. Prince of; Ward, Wilfrid; York, Archbishop of. *See also the Guardian, Times, Tablet*, the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, and the English Bishops on the Bristol Address
 Correspondents, the Author's thanks to, 3.
 Courcelle, M. Maurice, reference to, 357.
 Cranmer, Archbishop, and the English Ordinal, 147, 361, 368, 394.
 Creighton, Right Rev. Mandell. *See* Peterborough, Bishop of.
Daily Chronicle, report of Lord Halifax's speech to the E. C. U., 293.
 Dalbus, M. Fernand, name used by the Abbé Portal. *See* Portal.
 Dangin, M. Thureau, reference to, 311.
 Darboy, Mgr. (Archbishop of Paris), references to, 4.
 Davidson, Right Rev. Randall T. *See* Rochester, Bishop of.
 De Augustinis, Fr.
 Member of the Pope's Commission, 26, 271, 284, 286, 288, 290, 293, 302, 389 *n.*
 Memorandum on Anglican Orders, references to, 26, 29, 271, 284, 286, 389, 393.

- De Buck, Fr., on Reunion, 4, 11.
- D'Hautpoul, Mgr., visit of Lord Halifax to, 427.
- De Hierarchia.* See Lacey, Rev. T. A., and Denny, Rev. E.
- d'Hulst, Mgr., on the present state of Reunion, 24, 25, 248, 249, 251, 255, 263, 272.
- De Lisle, Ambrose, and Reunion 311.
- De Lugo, Cardinal—
On the Essential Form in Ordination, 261.
On Transubstantiation, 437.
- De Maistre, Comte, *Considérations sur la France*, reference to, 228, 262, 416.
- De Re Anglicana.* See Lacey, Rev. T. A.
- De Unitate Ecclesiae.* See Encyclicals, *Satis Cognitum*.
- Decretum ad Armenos.* See Eugenius IV.
- Denny, Rev. E. (and the Rev. T. A. Lacey)—
De Hierarchia, 18, 27, 92 n., 127, 193, 196 n., 218, 277, 304, 375.
Letters to Lord Halifax, 80, 375.
- Döllinger, Dr. von, on Reunion, 5, 7, 268; on Roman supremacy, 23, 232.
- Dover, Bishop of, on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 221.
- Doyle (Roman Catholic), Bishop of Kildare, on Reunion, 184.
- Dublin, Archbishop of, Invalid Consecration of a bishop (Señor Cabrera) for Spain, 85, 145-147, 152. See also the Toledo Correspondence.
- Duchesne, the Abbé—
On Anglican Orders (M. Portal's pamphlet, etc.), 13, 19 n., 29, 71, 78, 80-84, 128, 137, 152, 157, 172 n., 195, 217, 239, 240 nn., 388; Memorandum for the Pope on, 172 n., 203, 217, 388.
Honorary doctorate of Cambridge conferred on, 296, 321, 322.
Letters to—
Lord Halifax, 193, 222.
Rev. T. A. Lacey, 195.
M. Portal, 78, 373.
Member of the Pope's Commission, 26, 271, 273, 281, 284, 286, 288-290, 292, 293, 389 n., 393.
- Duchesne, the Abbé—
Minor references to, 299, 302, 303, 305, 308, 309, 319, 321, 338, 377, 428, 429.
Visit to England, 321, 322.
Writings of, denounced to the Holy Office, 19 n., 200-202; Intervention of Cardinal Rampolla, 200.
- Dupanloup, Mgr., Bishop of Orleans, references to, 7, 98, 332 n., 394, 444.
- Durham, Bishops of—
(Lightfoot), reference to, 223.
(Westcott), letter to Lord Halifax on Reunion, 6, 7 nn.
- EARLE, RIGHT REV. A. See Marlborough, Bishop of.
- Eastern Churches—
Anglican Orders and, Statement by Cardinal Vaughan, 128 n.
Essential Forms in Ordination, view of, 81, 82.
Forms of Baptism, 388.
Implicit recognition of, by Rome, 51, 52, 398, 400 n.
Overtures towards, by LEO XIII., 14, 97, 113, 309, 353.
Reunion and. See Russian Church.
- Eaton Square, etc., London Letters (Lord Halifax), 70, 74, 83, 88, 104, 167, 183, 294, 305, 307, 328, 331, 332, 341.
- Edward VI., Bishops under, and later, 360, 361, 392; Liturgy of, reference to, 70 n., 210.
- Edward VII., visit to Rome, 427, 428, 430, 433. See also Wales, Prince of.
- Elizabeth, Queen, attitude of Rome towards, 309, 319, 413.
- Ellicott, Right Rev. C. See Gloucester, Bishop of.
- Emmaus, Bishop of, reference to, 118 n.
- Encyclicals—
Ad Anglos, 20, 31, 212-214, 323, 326, 329, 348; its reception in England, 216-229.
Praeclara, 38, 180.
Satis Cognitum, 31-34, 303, 308, 310, 323, 352, 370, 381.
- English Bishops, letters of, on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 187-193.
- English Church Union, references to, 18, 56, 143, 145, 152, 215, 222, 293, 294, 370. See also Halifax, Lord, addresses on behalf of.

English Ordinal—
 Ordinal changes, 256, 373, 374, 379, 380, 395.
 Paul IV. and Julius III., and, 373, 374.
 Practical character of, 405. *See also* Anglican Orders, Commission on.
 English Roman Catholics. *See* Roman Church in England.
 Episcopate, the. *See* Roman claims to supremacy.
 Estcourt, Canon, on English Orders, 196.
Etudes Religieuses des Pères Jésuites, reference to, 87.
 Eucharistic Sacrifice. *See under* Sacrifice of the Mass and Transubstantiation.
 Eugenius IV., *Decretum ad Armenos*, reference to, 51 n., 74, 177, 373, 393, 396.
 Everest, Canon W. F., *The Gift of the Keys*, by, references to, 23, 230, 232, 234, 239.
 FABER, FR., reference to, 5.
 Fabre, M. Paul, references to, 292, 310.
 Farrar, Bishop, Case of, 286.
 — Ven. Archdeacon, reference to, 139.
 Faussett, Rev. Godfrey, Cardinal Newman's letter to, 439.
Feria Quinta, Session of the Holy Office on, 30, 360.
 Ferrand, Dr., reference to, 249, 263.
 Ferrata, Cardinal, interviews with Lord Halifax, 428, 430-431.
 Festing, Right Rev. J. W. *See* St. Albans, Bishop of.
 Fleming, Fr. David, Member of the Pope's Commission, 26, 271, 273 n., 279 n., 290.
 Fongrave, M., reference to, 24, 251, 287.
 — *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne*, 251, 287.
 Fonteneau, Mgr., reference to, 83 n.
 Forbes, Bishop. *See* Brechin, Bishop of.
 Forms of Ordination—
 The essentials in, 30 n., 50-53, 71, 74-76, 81, 82, 253-254, 261, 262, 313, 373-375, 392-394.
Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, 374.
 Other ancient forms, 374.
 Roman rites, 50-52.

Franco-German War, reference to, 7 n., 50.
 Franzelin, Cardinal, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, 129, 235 n., 395, 437.
 French Church—
 Banishment of the Religious Orders, 427-430.
 Informal conference at Paris, 24, 25, 217-220, 247-265.
 Movement towards Reunion in, 14, 24, 25, 38, 39, 97-101, 127, 217-220, 228 n., 247-265, 272, 315, 339.
 Political relations of, with the State, 49, 50, 287, 417, 427-430. *See also* Portal, the Abbé, and his work.
 Frere, Rev. Walter, on the Marian Reaction, 302.
 Funchal, letters from (Lord Halifax), 40.
 GALIMBERTI, CARDINAL, death of, 302.
 Gallican Church, controversy with Rome, 258.
 Gardiner, Bishop, on the jurisdiction of Rome, 236, 362 n.
 Garrowby, letters from (Lord Halifax), 45, 47, 54, 70, 238.
 Gasquet, Dom—
 Anglican Orders, inimical attitude towards, 198-199, 285, 287, 290, 301, 367, 376, 378, 379, 381, 384 n.
 Halifax, Lord, conversation with, on the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the English Ordinal, 210.
Leaves from My Diary by, reference to, 21 n., 28, 120 n., 126 n., 162, 163, 164 n., 172 n., 201 n., 210 n., 218 n., 301, 340 n., 384, 388 n., 389 n.
 Member of the Pope's Commission, 26; view of its internal character, 28, 270, 273, 279 n.
 Minor references, 30 n., 180, 209, 239, 362.
Risposta All'Opuscolo (De Re Anglicana) by, and J. C. Moyes, 27, 29, 33, 111, 354, 359, 360-366, 378-379, 390.
 Vaughan, Cardinal, interview with, 163-165.
 Gasparri, Mgr.—
 Consultant to the Pope's Commission, 26, 27, 29, 92, 272, 279, 280, 284, 288, 290.

Gasparri, Mgr.—

De la Valeur des Ordinations Anglicanes by, 196, 217, 218, 240, 241.

Minor references, 196, 254 n., 257, 261, 281, 286, 292, 297, 299, 302, 322, 328, 393, 434.

George v., Author's acknowledgment of permission to publish a letter from His late Majesty Edward VII., 3.

Germany, Emperor of (William II.), visit to the Pope, 427, 428.

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—

Halifax, Lord, Correspondence with, 267-268, 290, 304, 305, 319, 365, 390.

— visit to Hawarden, 294, 296, 301.

Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture by, 78.

Letter to Fr. Puller, 318.

Memorandum by (*Soliloquium*), 296, 312-318, 319, 320, 339, 365-366.

— the *Times* on, 365, 366.

Minor references to, 60 n., 277, 291, 294 n., 301, 308, 321, 344, 347, 356.

Glorieux, Mgr., references to, 427, 428.

Gloucester, Bishop of (Ellicott), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 188; on the Memorandum on Reunion, 221, 268, 269.

Godrich, Bishop, retains his See under Edward VI. and Mary, 361.

Gordon Case, the, Decision of the Holy Office in, 30, 208.

Gore, Canon Charles (now Bishop of Oxford)—

On the Encyclical *Ad Anglos*, 220.

Roman Claims by, reference to, 23, 232.

Gosse, Edmund, Author's acknowledgment of assistance rendered by, 3.

Gott, Right Rev. J. See Truro, Bishop of.

Greek Church, Gregory IX. and, Greek ordinations, 396 n. See also Russian Church.

Gregory IX. and Greek ordinations, 396 n.

Grey, Earl, visit to Rome with Lord Halifax, 430-434.

Grosseteste, letter to Innocent IV., 195.

Guardian—

Canterbury, Archbishop, Report of Address on Reunion, 70, 169.

Halifax, Lord, letter to, 342, 343.

Portal, M., letter to, on the Toledo Correspondence, 151-153.

Report of M. Portal's speech on the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, 32, 33, 332-339, 342, 343.

Review of *Les Ordinations Anglicanes* in, 71, 74.

Ward, Wilfrid, letter to, 376 n.

Guéranger, Dom, *La Monarchie Pontificale*, 42.

Guibert, Cardinal (Archbishop of Paris), letter to, by Lord Halifax, 56.

HALDANE, RIGHT REV. J. R. A. C. See Argyll, Bishop of.

Halifax, Lady, letters from Rome by Lord Halifax to, 427-435.

Halifax Lord,—

Leo XIII., and Anglican Orders, by, 1-445.

Résumé of the Book—

— Appendices, 423-445.

— Introduction, 1-39

— Notes and connecting narrative, 40, 48, 64, 71, 88, 95-101, 102, 104, 111, 112, 118-126, 127, 132, 135, 140-143, 145-148, 150-159, 163, 165, 176-179, 180, 183-185, 187, 192, 193, 197-202, 209-224, 225-228, 230, 231, 236, 240, 241-243, 247-270, 271, 272, 278, 280, 285-286, 287, 288, 296, 300-301, 305, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323-327, 339-342, 345, 346, 354-356, 360-369, 371, 372, 375, 376.

— Reasons for the record, 1, 2.

— Retrospect and outlook, 35-39, 381-422.

Addresses and speeches by (Bristol), 163 n., 180-193, 205 (Church Congress, Norwich), 22, 231-233, 238, 239 (E. C. U., 1895), 18, 293 (Leeds), 182.

On the Bull, *Apostolicae Curae*, 31, 32, 354, 357-359, 369-372, 378-382, 390, 397.

Canterbury, Archbishop, Correspondence and Interviews with. See Canterbury, Archbishop.

Halifax, Lord—

Commission on Anglican Orders, account of its initiation and development, 15, 20, 28, 32, 113-123, 287, 298, 299, 304, 307-310, 341. *See also* Anglican Orders; Canterbury, Archbishop; Portal, Abbé; and Cardinals Rampolla and Vaughan.

Correspondence, the. *See* Correspondence.

Encyclicals. *See* Encyclicals.

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., the Memorandum. *See* Gladstone.

Leo XIII., Audiences with, 18-20, 201-209, 211, 425, 433, 434; sketch of a proposed Letter as from Leo XIII., 132, 135-136, 158, 175-176, 181, 182, 206, 207.

Memorandum to—

— Canterbury, Archbishop of (with M. Portal), 130, 132-135.

— Leo XIII., *The Memoire* of M. Portal, 202-207.

— Paris, Conference on, 217-220, 265-270.

— York, Archbishop of, letter to, 264.

Paris Conference (informal), 24, 25, 217-220, 247-267, 272.

Portal, the Abbé, Correspondence. *See* Portal, Personal friendship with, 2, 8-12, 34, 38, 39, 40, 95-100, 385.

Sacramental System, on the, 399-403.

Toledo Correspondence, the, 145-151, 152, 157, 174.

Vaughan, Cardinal, Correspondence and Interviews with. *See* Vaughan.

Visits to Rome, 18-20, 196-212, 425, 427-435.

Hampton Court Palace, letters from (Lord Halifax), 55.

Hankey, Rev. W. B., notes on Infallibility, 269, 270.

Hanley, address by Cardinal Vaughan at, 368, 384, 391.

Hawarden, death of Archbishop Benson at, 376. *See also* Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.

Hedley, Bishop. *See* Newport.

Heron's Ghyll, letter from (W. Ward), 239.

Hickleton, letters from (Lord Halifax), 42, 59, 65, 71, 74, 95, 101, 105, 106, 118, 130, 160, 161, 166, 290, 330, 352, 353, 357.

Holland, Canon Scott, on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 187.

Holy Office, Commission of Cardinals on Anglican Orders, 30, 289, 299, 303, 354, 360, 376, 388-390. Adverse decision, 31, 354, 388-394. Procedure of, *Feria Quinta*, 30, 360. Writings of MM. Duchesne and Portal denounced to, 19 n., 200, 201, 202.

How, Right Rev. Walsham. *See* Wakefield, Bishop of.

Hügel, Baron von, references to, 218, 230, 239, 240, 251, 284, 377.

Memorandum on Anglican Orders, 218.

INDIVIDUAL CONVERSIONS or Corporate Reunion. *See* Reunion, and under Cardinal Vaughan.

Infallibility, Papal—

Doctrine of, 7, 8, 120, 124, 183 n., 249, 253, 255, 260, 261, 269, 270, 324, 360, 381, 394.

Decision on *Feria Quinta*, 360.

Proclamation of (1870), 7, 8.

Innocent IV., reference to, 152.

Intention, the doctrine of, 71, 261, 271, 279, 283, 290, 291, 299, 300, 313, 379, 380, 392, 393, 400 n.

Ireland, Archbishop, references to, 250, 428, 479.

Irish Roman Catholics. *See* Roman Catholics in England.

JANYSHEFF, M., chaplain to the Czar, on Reunion, 77, 241.

Jayne, Right Rev. F. J. *See* Chester, Bishop of.

Jermyn, Most Rev. H. W. *See* Brechin, Bishop of.

Julius III. and Paul IV., implicit recognition of English Orders, 373-374.

Jurisdiction. *See* Roman Supremacy.

KANT, Category of Substance, reference to, 129 n.

Kelke, Rev. John, 383, 441.

Letter from Dr. Pusey to, 441.

Kelly, Right Rev. J. B. K. *See* Moray and Ross, Bishop of.

Kempsey, letter from (Rev. F. Denny), 80.

Khomiakoff, *L'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme*, reference to, 48 n., 50 n.

King, Bishop, retains his See under Edward VI. and Mary, 361.

King, Right Rev. E. See Lincoln, Bishop of.

Kirieff, General, reference to, 77.

Kitchin, Bishop, retains his See under Edward VI. and Mary, 361.

LACEY REV. T. A.—

A Roman Diary by, references to, 26, 111 n., 302, 392 n.

Author's acknowledgment of assistance rendered by, 3.

(and Denny, Rev. E.), *De Hierarchia* by, 18, 27, 92 n., 127, 193, 196 n., 201, 218, 277, 304, 375.

De Re Anglicana by, 304, 360.

— *Risposta all' Opuscolo* on, 27 n., 29, 111 n., 304, 359, 360-367.

Duchesne, the Abbé, letter from, 195.

On the Encyclicals: *Ad Anglos*, 212, *Satis Cognitum*, 328 n.

Gasparri, Mgr., note on his pamphlet by, 240.

Halifax, Lord, correspondence with, 128, 194, 212, 234, 236, 240, 328 n.

Reply to questions raised by, the Bishop of Springfield, 236; Cardinal Vaughan, 194, 195, 234-238.

Transubstantiation, note on the meaning of, 128, 129, 441.

Visit to Rome with Fr. Puller on account of the Pope's Commission, 27-29, 272, 275-276, 278, 280, 284, 286, 288-292, 302-304, 307-310, 327, 333, 343, 357.

Lake, Very Rev. W. C., D.D., letter from Lord Halifax to, 85, 145 n.

Lamb, Charles, anecdote of, 321.

Lathbury, D. C. (Editor of the *Guardian*), letters to Lord Halifax, 127, 129 n., 142.

Latimer, Bishop, on the Sacrifice of the Mass, 210.

Laud, Archbishop, references to, 184, 414.

Lauder, Sir Thomas Dick, letter to Lord Halifax on Reunion, 269.

Lavedan, M., reference to, 251, 263.

Lazarist Community at Paris, description of, 247, 248.

Leander, Dom, Mission of, 414.

Lefroy, Dean, reference to, 238.

Leo XIII.—

The Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 30, 31, 34-39, 277, 278, 348, 354-360, 368 382, 388-394; Anglican Orders condemned by, 34, 354-360.

Commission on Anglican Orders. See Anglican Orders.

Death of, 2, 425.

Encyclicals: *Ad Anglos*, 20, 31, 212-229, 323, 326, 329, 348; *Praeclara*, 38, 180; *Satis Cognitum*, 31-34, 303, 308, 310, 323, 352, 370, 381.

Halifax, Lord, Audiences with, 18-20, 201-209, 211, 425-427, 433, 434.

— *Mémoire* on Anglican Orders by (and M. Portal), presented to, 202-209.

Personal attitude of, towards Reunion, 19, 25-27, 38, 39, 154, 155, 181, 222, 223, 266, 267, 275, 279, 281, 284, 288, 294, 297-298, 301, 305, 306, 314, 316, 334, 339, 348, 425-426, 428, 434.

— characteristics of, 20, 25-26, 41, 98, 120, 121, 156, 211, 222-223, 316, 428, 429, 433.

Portal, M., Interviews with, 114-123, 172, 334.

Reply of the English Archbishops to (*Sæpius Officio*), 35, 369, 370, 376, 396, 423-425.

— Letter from the Pope on, 35.

Sketch of a proposed letter as from the Pope to the English Archbishops, 132, 135, 136, 158, 175, 176, 181, 182, 206, 207.

Vaughan, Cardinal, influence with, 17, 163-165, 198, 199, 215.

Levé, M. (Editor of the *Monde*), references to, 94, 250, 350 n., 357.

Libourne, letters from (M. Portal), 102, 103.

Liddon, Canon, on the work of the Reformation, 412.

Lightfoot, Right Rev. J. B. See Durham, Bishop of.

Lincoln, Bishop of (King)—

On Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 189.

Minor references, 251, 268 n., 288.

Trial of, 42, 45, 47, 121, 362.

— ground of the Archbishop's decision, 362.

Lingard, letter to Cardinal Wiseman, reference to, 392 n.

Liverpool, Bishop of (Ryle), reference to, 139.

- Llandaff, Bishop of, on Lord Halifax's Memorandum on Reunion, 221.
- Llavaneras, Fr. José Calasanzio, Member of the Pope's Commission, 26.
- Lockhart, Fr., on Reunion, 4.
- Loisy, the Abbé, reference to, 377.
- Lorin, M., references to, 94, 102-104, 182-182, 197, 251, 263.
- Lothian, Lord, on Reunion, 14.
- Louvain, letters from (M. Portal), 177.
- Lugard, Sir F. D., reference to, 66.
- MACLAGAN, ARCHBISHOP. *See* York, Archbishop.
- Madingley, letters from (Rev. T. A. Lacey), 128, 194, 234.
- Madrid, letter from (M. Portal), 44.
- Manning, Archbishop—
Attitude towards Reunion, 5, 14, 101, 311, 367, 414, 444.
On the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, 129, 395; on Papal Infallibility (Vatican Council), 7, 260, 394.
Life of, by Mr. Purcell, reference to, 7 n., 259 n., 311, 395, 414.
- Marlborough, Bishop of, reference to, 161, 162 *nn.*
- Mason, Canon, *Life of Archbishop Benson* by, 124, 142, 165, 355 n., 366 n.
- Massingham, Mr. (Editor of the *Daily Chronicle*), 285.
- Mazzella, Cardinal—
General references to, 279, 308, 331, 360, 376, 388, 389.
President of the Pope's Commission, 279, 389.
- Merry del Val, Cardinal (now Cardinal Secretary of State), attitude towards Reunion, 216, 273-274, 287, 288.
- Milligan, Rev. W., reference to, 265.
- Milne, Rev. J. R., M. A., *Considerations on Eucharistic Worship* by, 235.
- Missiona, in Central Africa and Uganda, relations between, and Roman Missions, 66-67.
- Molescroft, letters from (W. Ward), 109, 110, 162, 185, 376.
- Montagu, Bishop, writings of, 184.
- Montalembert, M. de, 332 n.
- Moore, Rev. Aubrey, reference to, 50, 51.
- Moray and Ross, Bishop of (Kelly), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 189.
- Morin, Dom Germain, reference to, 82.
- Moscow, letters from (W. J. Birbeck), 77, 81.
- Mourey, Mgr., references to, 197, 302, 427, 429, 430.
- Moyes, Canon J. C. (and Dom Gasquet), *Risposta all' Opuscolo (De Re Anglicana)*, 27, 29, 111 n., 359, 360-369, 378, 379, 390.
Member of the Pope's Commission, 26, 270, 273-274, 279 n., 290.
Minor references to, 292, 302, 354, 376, 381.
- Mozley, Dr. J., on the Renaissance, 407, 408.
- Murray (Roman Catholic) Archbishop of Dublin, on Reunion, 184.
- NAG'S HEAD FABLE, reference to, 30 n., 191, 241.
- Newman, Cardinal, references to, 4, 5, 14, 37, 44, 55, 56, 98, 252, 253, 324, 335, 362, 399.
On the Real Presence, 429-441.
- Newport (Roman Catholic) Bishop of (Hedley), on the Atonement, 300, 437-438.
- Nicholas, Bishop. *See* Alaska.
- Nominalism and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, 128 n.
- Norfolk, Duke of—
Minor references, 10 n., 178, 433.
Reunion, on the difficulties of, 158, 159, 181 n.
- Norwich, Church Congress at, address on Reunion by Lord Halifax, 22, 231, 238, 239.
- York, Archbishop of, Sermon on Reunion at, 230.
- OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT and the Russian Church, 77.
- Olmütz, Archbishop of, President of the Congress of Catholic Theologians (Velehrad), 400 n.
- Ordinal. *See* English.
- Ordination. *See* Forms of. *See also* Commission on Anglican Orders.
- Orleans, Archbishop of (Dupanloup), 7, 98, 332 n., 394, 444.
- Ormaneto, Mgr. Niccolò, Fr. Carmi's pamphlet on, reference to, 309, 413.

- Oxford, Bishop of (Stubbs), Visitation Charge, 379 *n.* See also Gore, Canon C., and Paget Rev. F.
- Oxford Movement, 4, 113, 154, 163, 233, 262-264, 361, 363, 383, 385.
- PAGET, DEAN F., letter to Lord Halifax, 372-373.
- Palladius, Metropolitan of St. Petersburg on Reunion, 241, 242, 243, 244.
- Papal Infallibility. See Infallibility. Paris—
- Archbishop of (Richard), interviews with M. Portal, 340, 341, 350. See also Darboy, Mgr. and Guibert, Cardinal.
- Informal conference on Reunion at, 24, 25, 217-220, 247-267, 272.
- Letters from—(M. Duchesne), 78; (Lord Halifax), 63; (M. Portal), 94, 95, 229, 321, 329, 330, 340.
- Parker, Archbishop, validity of the consecration of, 50, 82, 239, 313.
- Parocchi, Cardinal (Cardinal-Vicar)—
- Correspondence with Lord Halifax, 33, 341 *n.*, 342, 343, 347.
- General references to, 33, 304, 309, 310, 320, 341 *n.*, 342, 343, 345, 346, 347.
- Paul iv. (and Julius III.), Bull and Brief of, implicit recognition of Anglican Orders in, 241, 271, 373, 374, 392 *n.*
- Penal Laws before Roman Catholic Emancipation, 418, 419.
- Peploe, Rev. H. W. Webb, on the Encyclical *Ad Anglos*, 216.
- Perowne, Right Rev. J. J. S. See Worcester, Bishop of.
- Perraud, Cardinal, general references to, 46 *n.*, 340, 342.
- Peterborough, Bishop of (Mandell Creighton)—
- Discussion with M. Portal on the Supremacy of Rome, 97-98, 119.
- Halifax, Lord, Correspondence with, on *Apostolicae Curiae*, 367, 390; on the Bristol Address, 190, 191.
- Minor references to, 243-246, 288, 321, 322, 369, 376, 423.
- Representative of the English Church, at the Czar's Coronation, 243, 244, 245.
- Phillimore, Sir Walter, references to, 287, 288, 292, 297.
- Letter to Lord Halifax, 287, 288.
- Pitra, Cardinal, alleged discovery of documents relating to the Barlow Case, 82.
- Pius v., the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, 309, 319, 413, 414.
- Pius ix., Decrees of, 320, 365.
- Pobiédonostzeff, Constantine (Chief Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod), references to, 223, 224, 244, 245, 304.
- Letter to W. J. Birkbeck on Rome and the Russian Church, 223, 224, 303.
- Pole, Cardinal, and the Edwardine Ordinal, reference to, 128 *n.*, 392 *n.*
- Porrection. See Tradition of the Instruments.
- Portal, the Abbé—
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, interviews with, 15, 18, 99-100, 105, 123-125, 137-138, 181.
- — — Memorandum to, by. See *below*.
- Commission on Anglican Orders, account of its initiation and development, 15, 20, 28, 32, 113-123, 287, 298, 299, 304, 307-310, 341. See also Anglican Orders, Lord Halifax, and Cardinal Rampolla.
- Dalbus, Fernand, name under which Abbé Portal wrote, 80, 99 *n.*
- The Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, speech on, in London, 32-33, 330-339, 342; misrepresentations of, in the *Tablet*, 32-33, 340-353, 376 *n.*
- Halifax, Lord, Correspondence with, 11, 14, 40-68, 69-77, 83-87, 88-95, 101-104, 112-118, 143, 156, 157, 166, 177-178, 180-182, 186, 229, 230, 238-240, 272-276, 278-280, 284-290, 292-295, 296-299, 302-304, 307-310, 321-322, 327-332, 340-342, 347, 349, 353, 357-360, 369, 371, 423-425.
- Reunion and, first meeting with the Author (1889), 8-11.
- — — work of, in, an appreciation, 35-39, 199, 385.
- — — finally forbidden by Rome, 33, 342, 344, 346, 350.
- Leo XIII., Interviews with, 114-123, 172, 334; Memorandum to, by, 202-207.
- Les Ordinations Anglicanes* by, chief references to, 13, 19 *n.*, 70, 71, 74, 80, 81, 86, 87, 113 *n.*, 127, 137, 153, 172 *n.*, 177, 198, 200, 201. See also Duchesne, the Abbé on.

- Portal, the Abbé—
 Letters from the Abbé Duchesne, 78.
 — Mgr. Gasparri, 279.
 — Cardinal Rampolla, 153-155.
 Memorandum by, and Lord Halifax, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 130, 132-135, 162 *n.*, 164, 165.
 — to Leo XIII., 202-207.
 Minor references, 76 *n.*, 84, 113, 153, 197, 199, 211, 301, 306, 308, 321, 347, 367, 370-371.
 Paris Conference (Informal) arranged by, 24, 25, 247-265, 272.
 Rampolla, Cardinal, and the Commission on Anglican Orders. *See* Commission *above*.
Revue Anglo-Romaine. *See* *Revue Anglo-Romaine*.
 Summons to Rome, 15, 102-105, 112.
 Visits to England, 15, 88, 95-101, 164-165, 272, 278, 280, 330-339.
 Writings of, denounced to the Holy Office, 200, 201 *n.*; intervention of Cardinal Rampolla, 200.
 York, Archbishop, Letter of, on Reunion. *See* York.
 Pragmatic Sanction, reference to, 256.
 Preston, Cardinal Vaughan's Address at, 105-112, 124, 363, 384.
 Primacy of Honour or Jurisdiction. *See* Roman Supremacy.
 Puller, Fr., S. S. J. E., Author's acknowledgment of assistance rendered by, 3.
 Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, 318, 319; with Lord Halifax, 274 *n.*, 291, 292.
English Ordinations and the Sacrifice of the Mass by (from the *Revue*), 29, 247, 261, 265, 273, 282, 290-291, 300, 301, 379, 395; preface to, by the Archbishop of York, 18, 29, 282, 283, 395.
 Minor references, 28, 69, 70, 72, 73, 100, 101, 321, 327, 329, 338, 339, 341, 360.
The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome by, 222.
 Visit of, to Rome, with Rev. T. A. Lacey, 27, 29, 272, 275, 276, 278, 280, 282, 284, 286, 288-292, 297, 299, 302-304, 307-310, 327, 333, 343, 357.
 Purcell, Mr., letter on Reunion, 311.
See also Manning, Archbishop, *Life of*.
 Pusey, Dr., references to, 4, 5, 231, 249, 253, 255, 363, 383.
An Eirenicon, by, 4, 97, 441.
 Visit to France in the cause of Reunion, 4.
 Puy-de-Dôme, letters from (Lord Halifax), 63, 343, 346, 347, 349.
 RAFFLES, R. B., letter in the *Tablet* on the 'L'Abbé Duchesne and Anglican Orders,' 239 *n.*
 Ragey, Fr., references to, 251, 279, 284, 424.
 Rampolla, Cardinal, and the Informal Overtures towards Reunion, 15, 20, 28, 32, 113-118, 165, 202-207, 217, 266.
 Duchesne, the Abbé, interview with, 303, 321.
 Halifax, Lord, Correspondence with, 20, 27, 126, 207, 276, 278, 305, 342, 346-347, 349-353; Interviews with, 209, 425-426, 427, 430, 431, 434.
 Minor references, 24, 102, 169, 197, 200, 211, 250, 274, 276, 297, 302, 310, 349, 353, 425-426.
 Portal, the Abbé, correspondence with, 15, 153, 177, 275, 348 *n.*; Interviews with, 113-123, 217, 289, 298-299, 304, 307-310, 341.
 Von Hügel, Baron, Memorandum to, on Anglican Orders, 218.
 Real Presence, Doctrine of the. *See under* Sacrifice of the Mass and Transubstantiation.
 Reformation, need for, and its results, 210, 256, 257, 300, 381, 382, 401, 404, 407, 408, 412.
 Reordination, conditional, 81, 157, 240 *n.*, 254, 255, 262, 274, 289, 290, 294, 302, 374.
 Reply of the English Archbishops to Leo XIII., 35, 369-370, 396, 423, 425.
 Reunion—
 Anglican Orders, recognition of, by Rome, an absolute essential of, 10-12, 25, 32-34, 40, 64, 119, 138, 190-192, 199, 200, 208, 252-253, 384, 385.
 The Bull *Apostolicas Cere*, its effect on, 354-360, 368-382, 385-397, 425.

Reunion—

Corporate, question of the possibility of, 25, 27, 33, 112, 159, 168, 186, 248-249, 252-253, 273, 335, 350-352, 364, 366, 419, 443, 444.

French Church, initiative taken by. *See* French Church.

Growing desire for, 4, 18, 22, 184-196.

Mr. Gladstone's Memorandum (*Soliloquium*) on, 312-318.

Position of the Movement between 1894-1897, 339.

Protestantism a hindrance to, 159, 161-163, 168-169, 175, 183, 185, 305, 400-405, 418, 419.

Retrospect and Outlook, Lord Halifax on, 33-39, 333-435.

Vaughan, Cardinal. *See* Vaughan. *See also* the work of Lord Halifax, and the Abbé Portal.

Revue Anglo-Romaine (edited by M. Portal)—

General references, 153, 239 *n.*, 246-249, 251, 257, 265, 272 *n.*, 281, 284, 286, 298, 304, 308-310, 329 *n.*, 340, 342-344, 346, 351-353, 357.

Vatican objections to, 272 *n.*, 340, 342-344, 346, 351, 353. *See also* the writings of Duchesne, Gasparri, Portal, and Puller.

Revue de la Science Catholique, references to, 54, 55, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74.

Richard, Cardinal. *See* Paris, Archbishop of.

Ridley, Bishop, on the doctrine of Transubstantiation, 128 *n.*

Riley, Athelstan—

Correspondence with Lord Halifax, 173.

Interviews with Cardinal Vaughan, 17, 163 *n.* 173.

— Memorandum on, 174-176.

Risposta all' Opuscolo (De Re Anglicana), by J. C. Moyes and F. A. Gasquet, References to, 27 *n.*, 29, 111 *n.*, 359-366, 378-379, 390.

Rochester, Bishops of—

(Davidson) on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 191, 192.

(Talbot) on Lord Halifax's Memorandum (Paris Conference), 269.

Roman Church in England—

Attitude towards Reunion, 32, 33, 40, 147, 148, 153, 167-169, 217, 239, 251, 252, 277, 279, 335, 383, 385, 396, 399, 405, 415.

Ignorance of the doctrines of the Anglican Church displayed by members of, 9, 10, 98, 241, 246.

Roman Supremacy, discussion of the question of, 23, 25, 51, 58, 97, 98, 107-109, 124, 171, 178-179, 183, 194, 195, 199 *n.*, 225-238, 255, 256, 258-260, 270, 325, 326, 380, 381, 403-405, 408-410, 414, 416, 417.

Rome—

Letters from (Lord Halifax), 427-435.

(M. Portal), 113-117, 284-289, 297-299, 302-304, 307-310.

Roscoff, Lord Halifax at, 49, 53; Letters from (Lord Halifax), 52.

Rossetti, Christina, on Reunion, 398.

Royal Declaration (English Coronation Oath), Roman feeling on, 431-433.

Russian Church—

Friendly attitude towards Anglican Church, 195, 241-246, 336, 337; Bishop of Peterborough as Anglican Representative at the Czar's Coronation, 243-245.

Relations with Rome, 178, 179, 223, 224, 241-242, 304.

SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM, Lord Halifax on, 399-405.

Sacrifice of the Mass, discussion on references to, 210, 235, 265, 274, 275, 283, 299-301, 361, 378, 379, 395; Appendix II. on the Real Presence, 436-442.

St. Albans, Bishop of (Festing), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 188.

St. Augustine, Commemoration of the Landing of (1897), 174-176, 207; Quotation from, 324 *n.*

St. Chad, question as to the Consecration of, 81.

St. Cyprian, references to, 324, 387.

St. Irenæus, reference to, 406.

St. Louis, Archbishop of, reference to, 7 *n.*, 260.

St. Petersburg, letters from (W. J. Birkbeck), 244.

St. Stephen, reference to, 324.

- Salcot, Bishop, retains his See under Edward vi. and Mary, 361.
- Salisbury, Bishop of—
 General references to, 18, 84, 85, 113, 209, 223, 321, 322.
 Letter to Cardinal Bourret, 84, 85.
 — to Lord Halifax, 84.
- Sampson, Bishop, retains his See under Edward vi. and Mary, 361.
- Sardica, Council of, 237.
- Scannell, Fr. —
 Letters on Intention, reference to, 271.
 Member of the Pope's Commission, 26, 271, 286, 288, 289, 292, 293, 389 *n.*
- Segna, Cardinal, reference to, 273.
- Selwyn, William (Canon of Ely), letters on Reunion to Pope Pius ix., 37.
- Seymour, Right Rev. G. F. *See* Springfield, Bishop of.
- Sharpe, Rev. J., on Lord Halifax's Address at Bristol, 187.
- Shrewsbury, Lord, letter of Cardinal Wiseman on Reunion to, 184.
- Smith, Fr. Sydney, reference to, 239.
- Snead-Cox, J. G. (Editor of the *Tablet*), 326 *n.*
 — — *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, 31, 156-157, 172, 176-177, 326 *n.*, 383, 384, 392.
- Soliloquium*. *See* Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., Memorandum on Reunion.
- Southampton, letters from (Lord Halifax), 48.
- Spain, invalid consecration of a bishop for. *See* the Toledo Correspondence.
- Springfield, U.S.A., Bishop of, on the Question of Roman Supremacy, 236.
 Reply by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, 236.
- Stanley, Mgr. *See* Emmaus, Bishop of.
- Stubbs, Right Rev. W. *See* Oxford, Bishop of.
- Supremacy, Question of. *See* Roman Supremacy.
- Synthetic Society, reference to, 239.
- Tablet*, the—
 General references to, 30, 31, 37, 105-109, 195, 239, 252, 261, 265, 271, 319, 326 *n.*, 353 *n.*, 367.
- Tablet*, the—
 Misrepresentations of M. Portal's speech, 33, 341-346, 353 *n.*
 Vaughan, Cardinal, Address of, at Preston, 106-109.
- Talbot, Mgr., letter from Archbishop Manning to, 5, 367.
 — Right Rev. E. Stuart. *See* Rochester, Bishop of.
- Taunton, Rev. Ethelred, *English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, reference to, 413.
- Tavernier, M., general references to, 257, 332, 339, 350 *n.*, 376 *n.*, 423.
- Taylor, Archdeacon, references to, 27.
- Temple, Right Rev. F. *See* Canterbury, Archbishop of.
- Theodore, Archbishop, question as to the consecration of St. Chad, 81.
- Thirlby, Bishop, Consecration of, 392 *n.*; Embassy to Rome, 361; retains his See under Edward vi. and Mary, 361, 379.
- Thirty-first Article, references to, 261, 283, 290, 291, 300, 395.
- Thorndike, on the question of Roman Supremacy, 23, 232.
- Times*, the, Articles in—
 On the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, 355, 356.
 — Archbishop Benson's note on, 372.
 On the Encyclicals, *Ad Anglos*, 20, 22, 214, 215, 225-228; *Satis Cognitum*, 31, 323-327.
 On Mr. Gladstone's Memorandum, 365, 366.
 Vaughan, Cardinal, on Anglican Orders, 128 *n.*, 140, 146-148; the Toledo Correspondence, 146-148.
- Toledo, Archbishop of—
 Letters to, by Lord Halifax, 17, 145; by Cardinal Vaughan, 146-148.
- Tournely, quotation from, on Intention, 283 *n.*
- Tradition of the Instruments, references to, 51, 52, 274 *n.*, 282, 283, 374, 393.
- Transubstantiation and the Doctrine of the Real Presence, discussion of, 4, 97 *n.*, 128, 129, 295, 361, 396, 436-442; Appendix II., 436-442.
- Trent, Council of, decisions of, 5, 97, 184, 235-236, 249, 253, 254, 313, 337, 361, 374, 400 *n.*
- Truro, Bishop of (Gott), on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 189.

Unitas and *Unicitas*, distinction between, 322, 324.

Univers, references to, 152, 180, 251, 257, 332 *n.* 343, 344, 357.

Urban VIII. on the loss of England by Rome, 414.

Urban, Fr. John, speech of, at Congress of Catholic theologians (Velehrad), 329 *n.*, 400 *n.*

VALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDERS. *See* Anglican Orders, Commission on, Leo XIII., and Cardinal Vaughan.

Van Hoonaker, Dr., on Anglican Orders, 177.

Vannutelli, Cardinal Serafino, general references to, 303, 310, 321.

— — — Vincenzo, general references to, 302, 303, 308.

Vaughan, Cardinal—

Addresses of (Bristol), 21, 227-229; (Hanley), 368, 384 *n.*, 391 *n.*; (Preston), 105-112, 124, 363 *n.*, 384.

On Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 31, 354-356, 368, 384 and 391 *nn.*

— Vindication of, 35, 396.

On Encyclicals: *Ad Anglos*, 214, 215; *Satis Cognitum*, 31, 323-327, 343, 351.

Halifax, Lord,—

— — — Correspondence with, 150, 151, 186, 194, 233, 359, 371.

— — — Interviews with, 40, 100, 197, 209, 210.

— — — the Toledo Correspondence, 146-150.

Letter to Wilfrid Ward, 216.

Life of, by J. C. Snead-Cox, references to, 31, 156, 157, 172, 176, 177, 326 *n.*, 383, 384, 392.

Minor references, 2, 21, 63, 70, 85, 99, 101, 125, 151-153, 177, 178, 194, 200, 204, 209, 216, 229, 238, 270, 284-285, 303, 319, 321, 340, 349, 356, 366, 398, 437.

Personal characteristics of, 36, 37, 109, 111, 209, 210, 216.

Preface to Fr. Ragey's account of the recent Commission, 424, 425.

Reunion—

— — — Individual Conversions regarded as the only means of, 21, 25, 27, 64, 108, 109, 112, 186, 198-199, 229, 231, 233-234, 248, 366-369, 397.

Vaughan, Cardinal—
Reunion—

— — — Inimical attitude towards, 11-13, 16-27, 31, 34-37, 64, 70, 105-112, 124-126, 128, 139-143, 145-151, 156, 157, 160-166, 167, 173-175, 198, 214-217, 298, 305, 326-327, 355-356, 371-372, 385-388, 424-425, 444-445.

— — — his responsibility with regard to, 385-388.

Riley, Athelstan, interview with, 17, 163 *n.*, 173; Memorandum on, 174-176.

Visits to Rome, 165-167, 177.

Vives y Tuto, Cardinal, references to, 428, 432.

Von Hügel. *See* Hügel, Baron von.

WACE, VERY REV. H. (Dean of Canterbury), *Principles of the Reformation* by, 300.

Wakefield, Bishop of (Walsham How) on Lord Halifax's Bristol Address, 188.

Wales, Prince of (King Edward VII.), letter to Lord Halifax concerning the visit of the Bishop of Peterborough to the Czar's Coronation (1896), 243.

Ward, Wilfrid, Author's thanks to, 3.
On the Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 376-378.

Correspondence with Lord Halifax, 17, 105, 106, 109, 110, 142, 143, 149, 151, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 167, 169, 170, 178, 179, 183, 185, 216, 239, 292, 376-378.

— — — Memorandum on, Appendix III., 443-445.

Life of Cardinal Wiseman, references to, 110, 240, 377, 392, 413, 443.

Minor references, 5, 101, 123, 157, 186, 238, 251, 280, 394.

Vaughan, Cardinal, on—

— — — Attitude of, towards Reunion, 106, 109-111, 157-163, 173, 286, 298, 340 *n.*, 376, 385, 444-445.

— — — Interview with, 125, 126, 298, 444.

— — — Letter from, 216.

Warham, Archbishop, reference to, 316.

Weekly Register, reference to, 4.

Wellington, Miss, Author's acknowledgment of assistance rendered by, 3.

- Westcott, Right Rev. Brooke Foss. *See* Durham, Bishop of.
- Wharton, Bishop, retains his See under Edward VI. and Mary, 361.
- Wiseman, Cardinal, attitude towards Reunion, 184, 240, 284, 311, 443, 444.
- Letter to Lord Shrewsbury, 184, 284.
- Life of*, by Wilfrid Ward, references to, 101, 110, 240, 377, 392, 397, 413, 443.
- Wolsey, Cardinal, relations with Henry VIII., 362 *n*.
- Wood, Rev. E. G.—
- Correspondence with Lord Halifax, 225-227.
- Minor references, 97, 129.
- On the Papacy as a theological proposition, 225-227.
- Worcester, Bishop of (Perowne), reference to, 139.
- Wordsworth, Right Rev. J. *See* Salisbury, Bishop of.
- YORK, ARCHBISHOP OF (MacLagan)—
- Attitude towards the informal overtures from Rome, 140-144, 159, 166, 203, 205, 277, 279.
- Correspondence with Lord Halifax, 140, 166, 192, 277; on the Bristol Address, 192.
- Memorandum from Lord Halifax to, 264-267.
- Minor references, 2, 16, 17, 21, 34, 42, 74, 98, 99, 119, 125, 129, 131, 157, 178, 238, 239, 276, 277, 280, 284, 288, 290, 300, 308-309, 322, 359, 370, 396.
- Preface to Father Puller's *English Ordinations* by, 282-213.
- Reply of the English Archbishops to Leo XIII., 35, 369, 370, 396, 423-425.
- Reunion, letter to M. Portal on (27 March 1896), 28, 32, 275 *ac.*, 278, 279, 280-282, 287, 289, 290, 324.
- Sermon at the Norwich Church Congress on, 230.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

180531

HEECL.

Author Halifax, Charles Lindley Wood, Viscount H.

Title Leo XIII and Anglican Orders.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

L. Hayes

